DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 228 IR 008 888

AUTHOR Palmour, Vernon E.: DeWath, Nancy V.
TITLE Missouri Statewide Bibliographic Data Base Survey.
INSTITUTION King Research, Inc., Rockville, Md.
SPONS AGENCY Missouri Libraries Network Board, Jefferson City.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 104p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Data Bases: *Library Automation: Library Circulation: *Library Planning: Library Services: *Library Surveys: Library Technical Processes: *Needs Assessment: *Online Systems: Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS Missouri

ABSTRACT

This report contains the conduct, methodology, and major findings of a survey of all the libraries in Missouri to assess their needs for a statewide database. The survey addresses the current state of automation, the functions that libraries would like to see a database perform, the materials to be included in the database, and the means of financing and governing it. It also includes recommendations of the Missouri Bibliographic Data Base Committee developed from the survey. Appendices provide a survey background letter, the questionnaire, and detailed tables of survey results. (Author/RAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED195228

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

MISSOURI STATEWIDE BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA BASE SURVEY

Prepared by:

Vernon E. Palmour
Nancy V. DeWath

King Research, Inc.
6000 Executive Blvd.
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Prepared for:

Statewide Bibliographic Data Base Committee
Missouri Libraries Network Board

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Vernon E. Palmour

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

August 1980

IR008888

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	PREFACE	i
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background	1
	The Current Study	3
2	SURVEY METHODOLOGY	5
	Questionnaire Design	5
	Universe of Missouri Libraries	5
	Mailing, Follow-up, and Processing	6
3	SURVEY FINDINGS	7
	Response	7
	Descriptive Statistics	8
	Current and Planned Automation	9
	Machine-Readable Bibliographic Records	12
	Data Base Needs	15
	Characteristics of the Statewide Data Base	20
	Data Base Costs	21
	Governance	22
4	RECOMMENDATIONS	27
	APPENDIX A - BACKGROUND PAPER	30
	APPENDIX B - MISSOURI STATEWIDE LIBRARY DATA BASE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE	34
	APPENDIX C - DETAILED TABLES	56

PREFACE

This report contains the major findings of a survey of all the libraries of Missouri to assess their needs for a statewide bibliographic data base. The survey addressed the current state of automation in Missouri libraries; the functions that libraries would like to see the data base perform; the materials to be included in the data base; and the means of financing and governing it. The recommendations of the Missouri Statewide Bibliographic Data Base Committee, developed from the survey results, are also included.

The survey instrument itself was developed after extensive consultation with the Committee and meetings with librarians around the state regarding the issues that the survey should address. The results of the survey and the Committee's recommendations were discussed with the Missouri library community at the annual meeting of the Missouri Libraries Network Board on May 19, 1980.

The project benefited greatly from the active involvement of the Statewide Bibliographic Data Base Committee: Don Gaertner, St. Louis County Library, chairperson; Charles Churchwell, Washington University; James Corey, University of Missouri; Thomas Gillies, Linda Hall Library; Millard Johnson, Washington University School of Medicine; Karen Luebbert, Eden Webster Library; Sheila Merrell, St. Louis Regional Library Network; Bill Mills, Parkway North High School; Shannon Roy, Southwest Missouri Library Network; Philip Tompkins, University of Missouri-Kansas City; Bill Wilkinson, Monsanto Company; and James Zink, Southeast Missouri State University. State Librarian Charles O'Halloran and Assistant State Librarian Susanna Alexander also contributed to the Committee's work.

In addition, the project would not have been possible without the librarians of Missouri who took the time to attend the meetings and to respond to the survey.

The King Research project staff were Vernon E. Palmour, Nancy V. DeWath, Kathleen O'Brien, and Mark Evangelista.

King Research, Inc.
June 1980

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of the Missouri Statewide Library Data Base Survey and the recommendations of the Statewide Bibliographic Data Base Committee. The purpose of the survey was to assess the needs of the libraries of the state for a machine-readable data base of library materials, which could assist in the sharing of resources. Based on the survey and its own knowledge of the needs and capabilities of the state's libraries, the Committee developed recommendations to the Missouri Libraries Network Board.

The survey was a census of all the public, academic, and special libraries and school districts in Missouri. In preparation for the design of the questionnaire and to communicate the purpose of the study, open meetings were conducted in each of the seven network regions of the state. The regional meetings provided the opportunity for all librarians in the state to discuss their needs and concerns about a statewide bibliographic data base with the study team and Committee members.

Following the regional meetings, a questionnaire was designed by King Research, in close consultation with the Committee, and mailed to the libraries of the state. The questionnaire was designed to investigate the state of current and planned automation in each library; the number and types of bibliographic records already in machine-readable form; the importance of automating specified functions for responding library, and the importance of a statewide data base for those functions; the preferred characteristics of a statewide data base; libraries' opinions on possible ways to pay for a statewide data base; and their preferences on certain governance issues.

Forty-two percent of the questionnaires were returned. The highest response rates were from academic and public libraries, at 89 and 64 percent, respectively; these types of libraries would be the major users of and contributors to the proposed data base.

Among the libraries responding, 23 percent had automated at least one library function. Academic and special libraries are engaged in automation much more often than the other types of libraries. The most frequently-automated

function was cataloging, and the most used automated cataloging system was OCLC. Also ranking high on the list of automated functions was the management of periodicals: many libraries reported participating in the Missouri Union List of Serial Publications, which is maintained on a minicomputer at St. Louis Public Library.

The bibliographic records already in machine-readable form around the state consist primarily of OCLC and MULSP records for monographs and for periodicals.

The functions for which libraries would most like to see the data base used were: determining which libraries own specific monographs and periodicals for interlibrary lending and for making acquisitions decisions; searching the data base by subject; producing statewide and regional union lists of holdings in book or microform; and transmitting borrowing requests from one library to another.

The materials most wanted in the data base were the total holdings of adult non-fiction and periodicals, and adult fiction, documents, and juvenile materials ten years old or newer.

When asked about ways in which they would be willing to contribute to the costs of developing and maintaining the data base, many libraries' responses showed a lack of information about the nature and magnitude of such costs. Libraries already engaged in automation appeared to be better informed than those not currently automating any of their processes. Among the libraries willing to express an opinion, most were willing to contribute to the costs of adding and maintaining their own records and of producing union lists. Few were willing to support the development of the data base.

The last section of the questionnaire sought the libraries' views on possible governing bodies having the responsibility for the data base. Most libraries expressed a desire to vote directly on major policy decisions or to be represented by another library of the same type from the same region. The Statewide Bibliographic Data Base Committee made the following recommendations:

1. That its efforts be joined with those of the Corporation Study Committee and the results of their combined efforts on governance be reported to the Missouri Libraries Network Board. Governance is a difficult and important decision and the Committee does not feel that the findings of the survey are sufficient to make a recommendation at this time. The results of the survey did not give a clear direction as to the type of governance structure needed to operate a statewide data base; however, the results did indicate a strong preference for a representational structure. Since the Corporation Study Committee has been appointed by the State Librarian to study the question of governance for a not-for-profit organization, the Data Base Committee suggests immediate further study of a not-for-profit organization as a probable means of governing the data base.

2. The use of OCLC tapes and other existing data bases in MARC format as the source of records to begin the statewide data base. Expand the number of libraries adding new acquisitions as quickly as feasible. The 3.5 million monograph records already in machine-readable form are the logical starting point for the data base. The goal is to have as many libraries as possible contributing records. The Committee did not rule out retrospective conversion. Libraries which convert their own collections will be encouraged to contribute them to the data base. It is expected that decisions about converting other collections specifically in order to add them to the data base will be made by the data base managers as the need for such conversion becomes apparent.

3. The integration of the Missouri Union List of Serial Publications files into the statewide data base. The high priority that respondents placed on periodicals means that periodicals and other serials should be included in a statewide data base. Thirty-six respondents are already contributing to the MULSP file and 28 of them reported a total of 80,332 serial titles in the system. Thus, MULSP provides the beginning of a statewide serials data base;

more libraries should be added and these records integrated into a single statewide bibliographic data base.

4. The development of on-line access to the statewide data base for those libraries and networks requiring it and the generation from the statewide data base of microform finding lists with author, title, and subject access. The goal will be on-line access to the data base. The Committee recognizes, however, that on-line access is complex and costly. Furthermore, not all libraries will require direct on-line access. Access will be by author, title, and subject because of the strong preference for subject access expressed by survey respondents.

5. The exploration of the need for automatic message transmittal. The data base function for which respondents expressed a strong need was transmittal of interlibrary loan requests. Considerable improvements in ILL communications are possible in addition to an on-line message system.

6. Discussions with OCLC and other bibliographical utilities to avoid unnecessary duplication and cost. Most of the Missouri libraries that are automated use OCLC so the statewide data base should be planned in such a way as to build on this fact to avoid duplicating OCLC's, etc., services or operations.

7. That funds be sought from the State and other bodies to subsidize the development of the data base. A plan for charges and in-kind contributions for maintaining the statewide data base should be developed. Products, such as union lists, should be defined and pricing policies should be formulated. This recommendation stems from the survey findings that respondents are willing to bear the costs of maintaining the data base and to buy copies of products such as a union catalog, but not to support the development.

1. INTRODUCTION

Background

The development of networks has been one of the major accomplishments of Missouri libraries of the last few years. The Missouri State Network Plan [1], adopted by the Missouri Library Association and endorsed by the Coordinating Board for Higher Education, states that the goal of networking is "to make information resources available to every Missouri citizen through cooperation of all types of libraries." To this end, the major activities of the networks have been the identification, access, and delivery of resources.

One of the priorities identified in the Missouri State Network Plan is the assessment of the need for a machine-readable data base of library materials, print and non-print, located throughout the state. A data base containing bibliographic records of library materials would offer the possibility of improving access to existing resources for all users by making widely available current information on the holdings of the state's libraries.

Once bibliographic records were in machine-readable form -- that is, in a form in which a computer can manipulate them -- they could be easily updated, sorted, and collated to produce a variety of products; for example, listings of local, state, and regional holdings in a variety of forms, including paper and microform, as well as on-line (i.e., accessed directly through the computer). Such a data base could serve other functions as well. The information on each of the individual records could be copied onto book cards, spine labels, and so on, as well as catalog cards. Furthermore, the superior record-keeping capability of the computer means that it could support many interlibrary and intralibrary functions, including acquisitions and cataloging, interlibrary loan, circulation, serials control, and other services related to the financial management and general record-keeping of libraries, both individually and collectively.

Many Missouri libraries are currently engaged in or planning automation projects. For example, the Missouri State Library is collecting archive tapes -- the local cataloging records in machine-readable form -- for about 40

Missouri libraries using OCLC, a computerized cataloging system. Several libraries have microform catalogs produced from machine-readable records. Some libraries are installing automated circulation systems. The University of Missouri is considering using the Washington Library Network computer programs to create a system-wide, on-line catalog, and the Missouri Union List of Serial Publications uses a small computer to keep track of the holdings of more than fifty libraries, and produce holdings lists.

Even libraries that have not computerized their operations can benefit from the improved access to other collections and the services made possible by a statewide bibliographic data base. They will have faster, more accurate access to information about a greater range of materials. Furthermore, statewide efforts toward automation now can lay the groundwork that will make it much easier for other libraries to convert at some future time, as the cost of automation continues to go down. However, cooperation requires that these various systems be compatible. Differences in form of entry, depth of cataloging, and format among libraries and among automated systems make it difficult to consolidate different libraries' files into a single statewide data base. Such a data base requires careful planning and coordination.

The Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education and the State Library decided in 1978 that they needed advice on the proper role of automated systems in meeting the functional objectives of the library networks, and contracted with Becker and Hayes, Inc. to perform a preliminary analysis. The result, "A Statewide Data Base of Bibliographic Records for Missouri Libraries" [2], was disseminated, discussed, and revised, and the final version was distributed to the libraries of the state in January 1979.

The Becker and Hayes study recommended the establishment of a statewide data base. It was not to compete with existing on-line cataloging services such as OCLC, but to consolidate the machine-readable records generated by libraries using various automated systems and use them to support such functions as acquisitions and interlibrary loan communications and record-keeping.

As a result of the library community's response to the Becker and Hayes report, the Missouri Libraries Network Board appointed a Bibliographic Data Base Committee and gave it the following charges:

1. Develop an instrument for the purpose of verifying the needs and desires of the libraries of Missouri.

2. Develop specifications for a bibliographic data base (monographs and serials) as a result of the survey and related studies.

3. Prepare a detailed proposal and budget describing the process for implementing the prototype.

The Current Study

To fulfill the first charge, to collect factual information about the needs and desires of the state's libraries, the Bibliographic Data Base Committee contracted with King Research, Inc., to survey the libraries in Missouri. Work on the project began in October, 1979. The purpose of the survey was to assess the current level of library automation in the state and to identify the needs and desires of the libraries for a statewide bibliographic data base.

The survey was a census of all the public, academic, and special libraries and school districts in Missouri. In preparation for the design of the questionnaire and to communicate the purpose of the study, open meetings were conducted in each of the seven network regions of the state. The regional meetings provided the opportunity for all librarians in the state to discuss their needs and concerns about a statewide bibliographic data base with the study team and Committee members.

Following the regional meetings, a questionnaire was designed by King Research in close consultation with the Committee; field tested in 36 libraries; revised extensively as a result of the field test; and mailed to all libraries on the mailing list compiled by the State Library and the regional networks. Returns were edited, keypunched, and analyzed by computer. The results were reviewed by the Committee, and a summary report was prepared by King Research.

A review of the major findings was presented at a statewide multi-type library meeting held in May, 1980, to review the survey results and consider the

next steps in network development in Missouri. Based upon the survey findings, the Committee presented recommendations concerning the future development of a statewide bibliographic data base.

The purpose of this report is to describe the survey of Missouri libraries and present the analysis of survey results. Chapter 2 discusses the conduct of the survey. The analysis of survey data is given in Chapter 3. The Committee's recommendations resulting from the survey are presented in Chapter 4.

[1] Missouri Library Association. Missouri State Network Plan. September 30, 1977.

[2] Becker and Hayes, Inc. A Statewide Data Base of Bibliographic Records for Missouri Libraries. Los Angeles, Ca.: December 15, 1978; revised 1-1-79.

2. SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The survey was a census of all academic, public, and special libraries and school districts in Missouri. A census rather than a sample survey was chosen in order to provide the opportunity for all libraries to participate in the study.

Questionnaire Design

In preparation for the design of the questionnaire and to communicate the purpose of the study, open meetings were conducted in each of the seven network regions of the state. The regional meetings provided the opportunity for all librarians to discuss their needs and concerns about a statewide bibliographic data base with the study team and Committee members.

Following the regional meetings, a questionnaire was designed by King Research in close consultation with the Committee. The questionnaire sought information on current and planned automation activities in Missouri libraries, characteristics of machine-readable bibliographic records, data base needs, and desired characteristics of a statewide data base.

Since the questionnaire was to be administered by mail, it was necessary to thoroughly test the proposed questionnaire, instructions, and definitions of terms. It was also determined necessary to include with the questionnaire a brief background paper describing events leading to the survey and the purpose of the survey. Thirty-six libraries representing the different types, sizes, and locations of Missouri libraries were selected to test the survey package. The tests revealed the need for major modifications in certain sections of the questionnaire. These changes were incorporated into the form which received final review by the Committee. Copies of the final background paper and questionnaire are included as Appendices A and B of this report.

Universe of Missouri Libraries

The census survey required a mailing list for all libraries in the state. The most complete list was one available from the Missouri State Library.

Each of the seven regional network coordinators received copies of the libraries and addresses for their regions. Additions, deletions, and corrections were made by the coordinators, and a single consolidated list was provided to King Research.

Mailing, Follow-up, and Processing

Questionnaires were mailed to 1,195 libraries and school districts. Follow-up postcards were sent to libraries which had not responded within four weeks. The follow-up mailing resulted in a total of 498 responding libraries. While the overall response rate (42%) based upon the number of libraries may appear low, the responding libraries represented a high percentage of all library holdings in the state. Consequently, the overall response was considered adequate for the purpose of the survey.

The returned questionnaires were manually checked for completeness and consistency. They were next coded as preparation for keypunching. Once the data from the questionnaires were in machine-readable form, it was machine-edited. Preliminary computer tabulations were produced as the beginning stage of analysis.

3. SURVEY FINDINGS

The detailed tabulations of the survey results appear in Appendix C. The present section highlights the more significant results.

Response

Table 1 reports the response rate by type of library. The overall response rate of 42 percent is quite acceptable for this survey. The response rates for public and academic libraries are significantly higher, at 64 and 89 percent, respectively. These two types of libraries have been the most involved in networking in general and in planning for the data base in particular, and will probably be the most involved in the design, development, and use of the data base, so their high participation rate is especially encouraging.

School and special libraries presented particular problems, both in identifying the survey universe and in getting response. School libraries tend to be small, staffed by one person who may not be full-time or have formal library training. They are often geographically as well as professionally isolated from other types of libraries. The questionnaires were sent to school district headquarters, where there may or may not be a person designated to handle library programs. If there is no library coordinator, the school district personnel were unlikely to have known about the survey in advance and understood its implications. Furthermore, the committee had considerable difficulty identifying eligible school libraries and districts, so many questionnaires may have gone to ineligible addresses. Nevertheless, the number of school libraries responding is impressive: 47 percent of all respondents.

Special libraries are housed in non-library organizations and are often isolated from the library profession as a whole. The identification of the special libraries of the state was also difficult, so, as with school libraries, many survey instruments may have gone to ineligible addresses. In addition, because most special libraries have a limited subject scope, they may see few advantages and many institutional barriers to cooperation with publicly-supported libraries. Undoubtedly many special libraries did not respond because they felt that the survey did not apply to them or that they had no need for the data base.

TABLE 1. SURVEY RESPONSE RATES BY TYPE OF LIBRARY

Type of Library	Number Sent	Number Returned	Response Rate	Percent of Total Response
Public	143	91	64%	18%
Academic[1]	75	67	89%	14%
School[2]	646	235	36%	47%
Special	331	105	32%	21%
All	1,195	498	42%	100%

[1]Includes community college, college, and university libraries.

[2]Primarily school districts and a small number of private single schools.

Table 2 reports the response rate by region. As expected, the response was greater from the more urban areas around St. Louis, Kansas City, and Mid-Missouri, and less from the more sparsely populated areas with smaller libraries. The particularly low response from the Southeast may be related to the lack of an organized network in that area. The networks were an important means of communicating with libraries about the survey. In addition, in the public meetings librarians in the Southeast expressed less need for networking and library cooperation in general, and general satisfaction with the current system of interlibrary loan through the Missouri State Library.

By looking at the names of the responding libraries, the Committee determined that the major collections and the bulk of the total resources of the state were represented.

Descriptive Statistics

The first part of the questionnaire asked respondents for data describing their library, and their current volume of activity in such areas as cataloging, interlibrary loan, and circulation. These are reported in Tables 2A through 2F of Appendix C. These data are reported at the request of the Statewide Bibliographic Data Base Committee, but they must be used with extreme caution. The only information that we attempted to verify was the total volumes held by each library, and then only for libraries whose figures were missing or clearly inconsistent. Other ambiguities in the reported figures -- expenditures on

TABLE 2. RESPONSE BY REGION

Region	Number Sent	Number Returned	Response Rate	% of Total Response
1. Northwest	214	53	25%	11%
2. Kansas City	98	57	58	11
3. Southwest	214	64	30	13
4. Mid-Missouri	138	90	65	18
5. Northeast	64	41	64	8
6. St. Louis	321	143	45	29
7. Southeast	227	50	22	10
Total	1195	498	42%	100%

materials in excess of total operating expenditures, for example -- were not reconciled. The data on titles added were so clearly inconsistent with volumes added that we have not included them in the appendix tables.

Current and Planned Automation

The next section of the questionnaire asked respondents which functions were currently automated within their libraries or in the planning stages. These results are important in interpreting the responses to questions about the need for a data base and the functions that it might perform (below). Libraries already engaged in automation have a better understanding of the problems and the capabilities of automation, and may have different needs from those that do not currently enjoy automation's benefits. Furthermore, any statewide automation program can benefit from building on existing efforts.

By region, the Kansas City area is the most heavily automated, at 47 percent. Rural areas report virtually no automation; for example, only 6 percent of the Southeastern respondents have at least one function currently automated, (Table 3).

TABLE 3. EXTENT OF AUTOMATION BY REGION
(percent of regional respondents)

Region (no. of respondents)	At Least One Function Automated	At Least One Function Planned or Considering	No Plans to Automate
Northwest (53)	11%	6%	83%
Kansas City (57)	47	9	44
Southwest (64)	25	3	72
Mid-Missouri (90)	22	3	74
Northeast (41)	5	7	88
St. Louis (143)	29	11	59
Southeast (50)	6	6	88
All (498)	23	7	70

Table 4 shows that the most automated group of libraries are the college and university libraries, 71 percent of which have automated at least one function. Special, community college, and public libraries range from 36 to 25 percent, while only 6 percent of the school libraries reported having automated.

TABLE 4. EXTENT OF AUTOMATION BY TYPE OF LIBRARY

Extent of Automation	Type of Library (number of respondents) Public (91)	Com. Coll. (14)	Coll. & Univ. (45)	School (233)	Special (90)	A (4
At least one function automated	25%	27%	71%	6%	36%	2
Planning or considering automating at least one function - no current auto.	10	7	14	2	13	
No plans or No answer	65	67	15	92	51	7
Total*	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	10

*May not add to 100% because of rounding.

Table 5 lists the automation systems currently in use, by function. Cataloging is the most frequently automated function, and OCLC the most-used system. The Missouri Union List of Serial Publications is also a significant factor in Missouri automation, with 36 respondents using it. The interlibrary loan module of OCLC is used by 32 respondents. Forty-one libraries offer data base searches in one form or another (reference).

This high incidence of OCLC use is important for a number of reasons. First, it means that if the data base planners want to build on or avoid competing with existing automation activities, OCLC will figure largely in their planning. Second, many respondents to this survey are familiar with OCLC's operations and services, either because they use it themselves or because neighboring libraries do. Their responses are no doubt affected by their perceptions of automation's capabilities derived from their knowledge of OCLC, and their expectations about future OCLC services and about how the data base might relate to OCLC.

The lack of responses under "automation planned within two years" suggests that most libraries have a one year planning horizon for automation projects; if they expect to implement a system it is either planned within one year or still in the "seriously considering" stage. This is important in considering scheduling for the statewide data base.

Machine-Readable Bibliographic Records

In order to determine the kinds and numbers of records already available in machine-readable form, which might form the basis of the statewide data base, libraries that were already engaged in automation were asked to describe their data bases. Table 6 presents, for the respondents that answered the question, the total and average number of monograph titles now in machine-readable form. The totals do not take into account overlap among the various libraries' holdings. Table 7 shows that most respondents have only recently begun using automated systems and have not done retrospective conversion. This means that the majority of the titles reported in Table 7 are relatively new; probably less than five years old.

TABLE 5

Extent of Automation by System

Number of Respondents

System	Extent of Automation			
	Currently Automated	Automation Planned		
		Within 1 Year	Within 2 Years	Seriously Considering
Cataloging				
OCLC	56	7	2	13
In-house	5	1	1	2
Other	8	1	-	1
Periodicals				
OCLC (for cataloging)	15	4	-	8
MULSP	36	11	1	15
OCLC (for check-in)	1	-	-	1
In-house	9	-	-	3
Philsom	3	-	-	-
KULS	3	-	-	-
Other	2	1	-	-
Ordering				
In-house	6	1	-	2
Brodart	1	-	-	1
Other	2	1	1	6
Circulation				
In-house	5	1	2	4
CLSI	2	1	-	3
Gaylord	1	-	-	-
Other	2	1	-	-
Interlibrary Loan				
OCLC	32	3	-	9
Other	2	1	-	1
Reference	41	12	3	16
Management Information	21	1	1	16

TABLE 6

MONOGRAPHIC TITLES IN CATALOGING SYSTEMS

System (# respondents)	Total Titles	Average per Library	Average % of collection
OCLC (41)	2,076,300	35,800	20%
In-house (8)	1,018,300	24,840	73%
Other (9)	458,800	51,000	73%
All (58)	3,553,400	35,800	34%

TABLE 7. PROPORTIONS OF MONOGRAPHIC COLLECTIONS IN MACHINE-READABLE FORM AMONG LIBRARIES WITH AUTOMATED CATALOGING SYSTEMS

Proportion	Frequency	Percent
1-10%	23	41.8
11-20%	6	10.9
21-30%	5	9.1
31-40%	6	10.9
41-50%	1	1.8
51-60%	2	3.6
61-70%	1	1.8
71-80%	4	7.3
91-100%	7	12.7
TOTAL	55	100.0

Table 8 reports the number of titles in the different kinds of periodical systems. The libraries using OCLC to catalog periodicals tend to be adding newly-acquired titles, while those using the Missouri Union List of Serial Publications have most or all of their currently-received titles, regardless of when the subscriptions began.

TABLE 8. PERIODICAL TITLES IN AUTOMATED SYSTEMS

System (# Respondents)	Total Titles	Average Per Library	Ave. % of Holdings
OCLC (17)	3,425	201	16% (8)
MULSP (24)	70,726	2,947	93% (23)
In-house (2)	4,730	2,365	77% (3)

Data Base Needs

Respondents were asked to rate the possible functions of the data base according to (a) the importance of each function for their libraries, and (b) the importance of the statewide data base for this function. This two-dimensional rating was developed as a result of the pre-test, in which many librarians reported that they were unable to assign a single rating to a given function without considering the interaction of these two factors. In interpreting the findings we are only interested in the need for the data base to perform these functions, so the discussion below is based only on the (b) ratings. Tables 3A through 3H of Appendix C present the detailed tabulations. Table 9 lists the functions rated the most highly by each type of library.

In looking at the ratings of the various functions, it is important to keep in mind the differences among libraries. Although the same functions tended to be rated highly by the different types of libraries, the actual values for each function tended to vary. In some cases the differences among the top-rated functions were small, and for other types of libraries they were large.

The values in Table 3A, for all respondents, are a product of the number of libraries responding and the intensity of their preferences, as registered in the rating that each library assigned to a given function. Aggregating these

TABLE 9. PRIORITIES FOR STATEWIDE DATA BASE FUNCTIONS BY TYPE OF LIBRARY

Type of Library	Priority Functions (In Order of Importance)
Public	Determining owning libraries for ILL Transmitting ILL requests Searching other libraries' holdings by subject headings Determining which libraries own a title for acquisitions Production of statewide and regional union catalogs in book or microform Verifying form of entry for ILL
Community College	Searching other libraries' holdings by subject headings Production of union catalog of your region in book or microform Determining owning libraries for ILL Source of cataloging information Production of statewide union catalog in book or microform
College & University	Determining which other libraries own a given periodical title Searching other libraries' holdings by subject headings Determining owning libraries for ILL Production of union catalogs in book or microform Determining which libraries own a title for acquisitions
School	Source of cataloging information Determining which other libraries own a given periodical title Searching other libraries' holdings by subject headings Determining which libraries' own a title for acquisitions Determining owning libraries for ILL Transmitting ILL requests
Special	Determining which other libraries own a given periodical title Determining owning libraries for ILL Searching other libraries' holdings by subject headings Production of statewide and regional union catalogs in book or microform Transmitting ILL requests
All	Determining owning libraries for ILL (for monographs and periodicals) Searching other libraries' holdings by subject headings Production of statewide and regional union catalogs in book or microform Transmitting ILL requests Determining which libraries own a title for acquisitions

See also Appendix C, Tables 3A-4F.

values gives equal weight to every responding library. The result is that school libraries by their sheer numbers dominate the aggregate findings.

Another caution is the relatively small range over which the ratings fall. Among all public libraries taken together, for example, the values for the 22 functions rated range from 1.7 to 3.4 on a scale of 1 to 4. Although we can talk about functions that are rated relatively low and relatively high, the absolute range is not great and the differences between closely-rated functions are not significant.

Finally, in translating these stated needs into objectives for the data base one must keep in mind that a statewide bibliographic data base is not necessarily the best means of meeting these needs. Assessing libraries' needs is only the first step in planning. The data base planners still must decide which functions are appropriately handled on the state, regional, and local levels, and which needs could be better met by means other than the data base.

Public Libraries. The functions that public libraries rated as most important for a statewide data base are primarily related to interlibrary loan (Table 9), including determining owning libraries, transmitting requests, searching by subject, producing union catalogs, and verifying form of entry for ILL. Although there are some differences among public libraries of various sizes, generally the same set of functions appears at the top of each group's list. The only departure is for the smallest libraries, for whom verifying new titles for acquisitions and for cataloging appear among the most highly-rated functions. This group of libraries, being small and often geographically isolated, may lack more traditional verification tools.

Community College Libraries. This category was not subdivided by size because there were so few respondents. Their choices related to interlibrary activities as well, including verifying holding libraries and producing a union catalog, but in addition they wished to use the data base as a source of cataloging information.

College and University Libraries. This group placed higher priority on interlibrary loan of periodicals and on subject searching than did the other types. The smallest of these libraries were interested in the data base as a source of cataloging information and local catalog production, while the second largest group also wanted cataloging information. Generally, however, this group's choices were also oriented toward ILL.

School Districts. Schools also related interlibrary loan functions highly, but they also gave high evaluation to using the data base for cataloging and for acquisitions information. By size, the larger libraries tended to give overall higher ratings to all possible data base functions than the smaller ones did.

Special and Institutional Libraries. This group of libraries placed interlibrary loan functions high on their list, although their overall ratings tended to be lower than the other types of libraries'.

All Respondents. Two functions were among the most highly rated by all types of libraries: determining owning libraries for interlibrary loan, and searching other libraries' holdings by subject headings. Looking more broadly at the kinds of functions in which the respondents placed priority, the major purpose of the data base appears to be to support interlibrary loan, by providing verification of forms of entry and information on holdings of monographs and periodicals, allowing subject searching of other libraries' holdings, acting as a communications link for transmittal of requests, and producing union catalogs. However, there is also considerable demand for the data base as a source of cataloging information, especially among smaller libraries, and of information about owning libraries for acquisitions decisions, presumably to promote cooperative collection development.

The functions that receive low ratings are also relatively consistent across types of libraries. The least-desired functions include book fund accounting, circulation control, check-in of periodical issues, and ordering of materials, functions which may be considered primarily local but which are planned by some bibliographic utilities and are feasible for the Missouri data base.

Automation Status and Data Base Needs. Another factor, besides type, that could affect a library's perceived needs for the data base is the extent and type of its current automation efforts. Table 3G of Appendix C reports responses according to whether the library has implemented or is planning automation. Table 3H contrasts the libraries that are using OCLC for cataloging with those that are not.

Libraries at different stages of automation differed slightly in their priorities for data base functions. The libraries with no plans to automate placed equal emphasis on a whole range of functions, including determining owning libraries for acquisitions and for interlibrary loan of both periodicals and monographs, transmitting requests, searching by subject, and providing cataloging information. They also desired a union catalog. Libraries that are already automated differentiated more among the various functions, and were not as interested in using the data base for cataloging, but otherwise their priorities were similar to the non-automated libraries.

Comparing OCLC and non-OCLC libraries reveals more striking differences in the priorities for the data base. OCLC libraries gave a much higher rating to periodical locations, which was important but not as important as non-OCLC libraries. They were less interested in request transmittal and in determining owning libraries for acquisitions, functions available on OCLC; but they did want subject searching and a union catalog. Non-OCLC libraries also planned to use the data base as a source of cataloging information, which was not a priority among libraries using OCLC for this function. Overall, non-OCLC libraries tended to place a higher value on most of the possible statewide data base functions than the OCLC libraries, indicating that OCLC libraries may feel that they have less need, overall, for a statewide data base.

Characteristics of the Statewide Data Base

One of the major decisions to be made about the data base is the types and ages of the materials to be included. Tables 4A through 4F in Appendix C present the detailed tabulations of the responses by type of library. As with data base needs, different types of libraries expressed different intensities of preferences among the various materials, and the large number of school libraries means that the aggregate results (Table 4A) tend to reflect that group's priorities. To fully understand the responses we must look at each type of library individually.

Public Libraries. Using 2.5 (mid-way between useful and optional, on a 4-point scale,) as a cut-off, public libraries wanted ten years' worth of adult fiction, 20 years' non-fiction, and ten years' reference materials. One question that arose during the public meetings was whether materials not available for interlibrary loan, such as reference materials, should be included. The response from public libraries was that they should be, at least the newer ones. In addition, public libraries want to see ten years' periodicals, and the more recent state documents included. They were not particularly interested in Federal documents and films.

Among juvenile materials, public libraries only wanted fiction and non-fiction less than five years old. Other materials, including films, fell below the 2.5 cut-off. However, one must keep in mind that it was generally library directors who answered the questionnaire. A group of children's librarians wrote to the Bibliographic Data Base Committee to express the needs of their constituency.

Community College and College and University Libraries. Academic libraries expressed a need for older non-fiction and reference titles. They wanted a full run of periodicals, and Federal as well as state documents. The community colleges also wanted five years' worth of films, while the college and university libraries asked for newer books in languages other than English. Neither type of academic library expressed a need for juvenile materials.

School Districts. School libraries, as expected, expressed more of a desire for juvenile and young adult materials: basically five years' worth of all materials, except for ten years' of non-fiction. However, they also placed a high value on adult materials, generally wanting the last ten years' publications, except for five years' worth of documents and no books in non-English languages. The most striking feature of the schools' responses is the high rating for both juvenile and adult films, much higher than any other type of library.

Special and Institutional Libraries. Special libraries expressed no interest in fiction or juvenile materials, films, or books in languages other than English. Otherwise, however, they would like to see monographs up to 10 years old, periodicals up to 20 years old, and the newer state and Federal documents.

Other Materials Mentioned. Libraries were allowed to write in categories of materials in addition to those pre-defined. The most common write-ins were audiovisual materials of various sorts, and state and local history, local authors, and genealogy.

All Respondents. Combining the responses of the different library groups, we can conclude that overall most libraries could be satisfied with adult fiction and reference materials up to ten years old, complete non-fiction and periodical holdings, the newest non-English materials, and the last ten years of Federal and state documents. In addition, the large number of school libraries constitute a powerful voice for the inclusion of films. Among juvenile and young adult materials, all types up to ten years old will satisfy most of those who expressed a need for them, with no more than five years of picture books and periodicals required.

Data Base Costs

To decide the extent to which participating libraries would be willing to support the costs of the statewide bibliographic data base, we identified a number of data base cost elements and asked respondents to which they would be willing to contribute. Each question received a large proportion of "Don't know" responses, reflecting a general lack of information about the magnitude of the costs involved and uncertainty about the libraries' abilities to support additional services.

Table 10 reports the responses to each question by type of library. Overall, respondents were more willing to support the largely in-kind costs of adding, deleting, and maintaining their own records in the data base than to pay to access the data base on-line. They were unwilling to contribute to developing the data base, but were willing, for the most part, to buy copies of a paper or microform union catalog.

Academic and special libraries were more willing to commit themselves to an answer, and that answer tended more often to be "yes," than the public and school libraries. This is consistent with the greater incidence of automation among academic and special libraries, and with the findings of Table 11 that libraries currently automated or planning to automate gave more "Yes" answers and fewer "Don't knows" than those with no automation plans. The responses to this section reflect a general lack of information about the costs of a statewide bibliographic data base.

Governance

Two sets of questions were asked concerning governance. The first was the appropriate agency to administer the data base; the second, the kind of role the responding library wanted to have in data base policymaking.

Table 12 presents the responses by type of libraries. The alternative administering agencies received relatively close ratings, from 1.6 for the State Library with an advisory committee to 2.3 for a new organization, on a four-point scale. The State Library's rating was largely influenced by the number and intensity of preference of the school libraries, although all other types also rated this as the first alternative. College and university libraries also strongly favored a new organization, while the other types of libraries' second choice was the State Library acting alone.

The results of the first question are not necessarily consistent with the second, however, which asks how direct a role the respondent wants in policymaking. The phrasing of the two questions had something to do with the inconsistencies, since the second question assumes that decisions will be made by some

TABLE 10. DATA BASE COSTS BY TYPE OF LIBRARY

Percent Responding
(number of respondents)

Cost Elements		Public (89)	Com. Coll. (14)	Coll. & Univ. (45)	School (219)	Special (84)	All (474)
Do you think your library would be willing and able to:							
34. Contribute to the costs (in money and/or staff time)							
a. Of putting into the data base the records for your collection:	% Yes[1]	40	47	67	17	41	33
	% No	17	33	4	30	25	24
	% D/K	43	20	29	53	33	43
b. Of adding your new acquisitions?	% Yes	50	53	83	24	47	41
	% No	14	13	-	28	20	20
	% D/K	36	33	17	48	33	39
c. Of changing your records as items are withdrawn from your collection?	% Yes	49	60	81	24	41	40
	% No	15	7	-	27	21	20
	% D/K	36	33	19	48	38	40
35. Contribute to the costs of developing the data base (buying computer equipment, hiring programmers, etc.)?	% Yes	7	-	14	3	3	5
	% No	47	60	23	51	45	46
	% D/K	46	40	63	47	52	49
36. Buy copies of a state and/or regional union catalog on paper or microform?	% Yes	45	53	69	27	60	43
	% No	19	20	2	24	10	17
	% D/K	36	27	29	49	30	40
37. Pay to access the data base online? (That is, to be connected directly to the computer and pay each time you use the system.)	% Yes	17	33	38	7	36	19
	% No	35	40	2	34	18	28
	% D/K	48	27	60	59	46	53

[1] Numbers in each box represent proportion who answered yes, no, and don't know to the question. May not add to 100% because of rounding.

TABLE 11. DATA BASE COSTS BY AUTOMATION STATUS

Cost Elements		Automation Status (no. of respondents) At Least one Function Automated or Seriously Considering (145)	No Plans to Automate (330)
Do you think your library would be willing and able to:			
34. Contribute to the costs (in money and/or staff time)	% Yes[1]	62	20
a. Of putting into the data base the records for your collection:	% No	7	31
	% D/K	31	49
b. Of adding your new acquisitions?	% Yes	74	27
	% No	5	27
	% D/K	22	46
c. Of changing your records as items are withdrawn from your collection?	% Yes	69	27
	% No	6	26
	% D/K	25	47
35. Contribute to the costs of developing the data base (buying computer equipment, hiring programmers, etc.)?	% Yes	11	2
	% No	30	53
	% D/K	59	45
36. Buy copies of a state and/or regional union catalog on paper or microform?	% Yes	74	29
	% No	3	24
	% D/K	23	48
37. Pay to access the data base online? (That is, to be connected directly to the computer and pay each time you use the system.)	% Yes	43	9
	% No	10	36
	% D/K	47	56

[1]Numbers in each box represent proportion who answered yes, no, and don't know to the question. May not add to 100% because of rounding.

TABLE 12. GOVERNANCE

Mean Values of Responses

Lower number = more desirable

Rankings: 1 - Desirable
2 - Acceptable
3 - Don't Care
4 - Unacceptable

Alternative	Type of Library (number of responses) Public (74)	Com. Coll. (14)	Coll. & Univ. (50)	School (198)	Special (84)	All (420)
38. State Library	2.3	2.5	2.7	2.0	2.3	2.1
39. State Library, with advisory committee representing participating libraries	1.6	1.5	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.6
40. New organization governed by board representing participating libraries	2.4	2.7	1.8	2.4	2.2	2.3
If the participating libraries are to share in policymaking, how active a role would you want <u>your library</u> to have?						
42. Voting directly on major policy decisions	1.8	2.0	1.8	2.1	2.0	2.0
43. Represented by another library of your type from your region (policy decisions made by a committee or board)	2.0	2.4	2.1	1.9	1.8	1.9
44. Represented by another library of your type (on committee or board)	2.8	2.9	2.3	2.3	2.0	2.3
45. Represented by another library from your region (on committee or board)	2.9	2.7	3.0	2.6	2.7	2.7
46. Represented by your network (where established)	2.2	2.2	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.4

kind of representative organization. Public and academic libraries preferred a direct vote, even though in the first part both preferred the State Library acting with a representative advisory committee to administer the data base, while school and special libraries chose the most direct form of representation short of direct vote, that is, representation by a library of one's own type and region. Respondents were scattered in their ratings of the other alternatives. However, the ratings are generally too close for the rankings to be signficant.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Statewide Bibliographic Data Base Committee developed with the assistance of King Research a series of recommendations based on the findings of the survey and on the Committee's own assessment of the needs and situations of Missouri libraries. What follows are the Committee's recommendations, accompanied by the rationale for each.

1. <u>That its efforts be joined with those of the Corporation Study Committee and the results of their combined efforts on governance be reported to the Missouri Libraries Network Board.</u> Governance is a difficult and important decision and the Committee does not feel that the findings of the survey are sufficient to make a recommendation at this time. The results of the survey did not give a clear direction as to the type of governance structure needed to operate a statewide data base; however, the results did indicate a strong preference for a representational structure. Since the Corporation Study Committee has been appointed by the State Librarian to study the question of governance for a not-for-profit organization, the Data Base Committee suggests immediate further study of a not-for-profit organization as a probable means of governing the data base.

2. <u>The use of OCLC tapes and other existing data bases in MARC format as the source of records to begin the statewide data base. Expand the number of libraries adding new acquisitions as quickly as feasible.</u> The 3.5 million monograph records already in machine-readable form are the logical starting point for the data base. The goal is to have as many libraries as possible contributing records. The Committee did not rule out retrospective conversion. Libraries which convert their own collections will be encouraged to contribute them to the data base. It is expected that decisions about converting other collections specifically in order to add them to the data base will be made by the data base managers as the need for such conversion becomes apparent.

3. The integration of the Missouri Union List of Serial Publications files into the statewide data base. The high priority that respondents placed on periodicals means that periodicals and other serials should be included in a statewide data base. Thirty-six respondents are already contributing to the MULSP file and 28 of them reported a total of 80,332 serial titles in the system. Thus, MULSP provides the beginning of a statewide serials data base; more libraries should be added and these records integrated into a single statewide bibliographic data base.

4. The development of on-line access to the statewide data base for those libraries and networks requiring it and the generation from the statewide data base of microform finding lists with author, title, and subject access. The goal will be on-line access to the data base. The Committee recognizes, however, that on-line access is complex and costl . Furthermore, not all libraries will require direct on-line access. Access will be by author, title, and subject because of the strong preference for subject access expressed by survey respondents.

5. The exploration of the need for automatic message transmittal. The data base function for which respondents expressed a strong need was transmittal of interlibrary loan requests. Considerable improvements in ILL communications are possible in addition to an on-line message system.

6. Discussions with OCLC and other bibliographical utilities to avoid unnecessary duplication and cost. Most of the Missouri libraries that are automated use OCLC so the statewide data base should be planned in such a way as to build on this fact to avoid duplicating OCLC's, etc., services or operations.

7. That funds be sought from the State and other bodies to subsidize the development of the data base. A plan for charges and in-kind contributions for maintaining the statewide data base should be developed. Products, such as union lists, should be defined and

pricing policies should be formulated. This recommendation stems from the survey findings that respondents are willing to bear the costs of maintaining the data base and to buy copies of products such as a union catalog, but not to support the development.

APPENDIX A

BACKGROUND PAPER

BACKGROUND PAPER
MISSOURI BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA BASE SURVEY

The development of networks has been one of the major accomplishments of Missouri libraries of the last few years. The Missouri State Network Plan [1], adopted by the Missouri Library Association and endorsed by the Coordinating Board for Higher Education, states that the goal of networking is "to make information resources available to every Missouri citizen through cooperation of all types of libraries". To this end, the major activities of the networks have been the identification, access, and delivery of resources.

One of the priorities identified in the Missouri State Network Plan is the assessment of the need for a machine-readable data base of library materials, print and non-print, located throughout the state. A data base is simply a collection of records. A bibliographic data base is a collection of bibliographic records; the card catalog is the most familiar example. Such a data base would offer the possibility of improving access to existing resources for all users by making widely available current information on the holdings of the state's libraries.

Once bibliographic records are in machine-readable form - that is, in a form in which a computer can manipulate them - they can be easily updated, sorted, and collated to produce a variety of products; for example, listings of local, state, and regional holdings in a variety of forms, including paper and microform, as well as on-line (i.e., accessed directly through the computer). Such a data base could serve other functions as well. The information on each of the individual records can be copied onto book cards, spine labels, and so on, as well as catalog cards. Furthermore, the superior record-keeping capability of the computer means that it can support many interlibrary and intralibrary functions, including acquisitions and cataloging, interlibrary loan, circulation, serials control, and other services related to the financial management and general record-keeping of libraries, both individually and collectively. Doing all of these things cooperatively can make them cheaper for all.

Many Missouri libraries are currently engaged in or planning automation projects. For example, the Missouri State Library is collecting archive tapes - the local cataloging records in machine-readable form - for about 40 Missouri libraries using OCLC, a computerized cataloging system. Several libraries have microform catalogs produced from machine-readable records. Some libraries are installing automated circulation systems. The University of Missouri is considering using the Washington Library Network computer programs to create a system-wide on-line catalog. And the Missouri Union List of Serial Publications uses a small computer to keep track of the holdings of more than fifty libraries, and produce holdings lists.

Even libraries that have not computerized their operations can benefit from the improved access to other collections and the services made possible by a statewide bibliographic data base. They will have faster, more accurate access to information about a greater range of materials. Furthermore, statewide efforts toward automation now can lay the groundwork that will make it much easier for other libraries to convert at some future time, as the cost of automation continues to go down. However, cooperation requires that these various systems be

compatible. Differences in form of entry, depth of cataloging, and format among libraries and among automated systems make it difficult to consolidate different libraries' files into a single statewide data base. Such a data base requires careful planning and coordination.

The Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education and the State Library decided in 1978 that they needed advice on the proper role of automated systems in meeting the functional objectives of the library's networks, and contracted with Becker and Hayes, Inc. to perform a preliminary analysis. The result, "A Statewide Data Base of Bibliographic Records for Missouri Libraries" [2], was disseminated, discussed, and revised, and the final version was distributed to the libraries of the state in January, 1979.

The Becker and Hayes study recommended the establishment of a statewide data base. It was not to compete with existing on-line cataloging services such as OCLC, but to consolidate the machine-readable records generated by libraries using various automated systems and use them to support such functions as acquisitions and interlibrary loan communications and record-keeping.

As a result of the library community's response to the Becker and Hayes report, the Missouri Libraries Network Board appointed a Bibliographic Data Base Committee and gave it the following charges:

1. Develop an instrument for the purpose of verifying the needs and desires of the libraries of Missouri.

2. Develop specifications for a bibliographic data base (monographs and serials) as a result of the survey and related studies.

3. Prepare a detailed proposal and budget describing the process for implementing the prototype.

To fulfill the first charge, to collect factual information about the needs and desires of the state's libraries, the Committee contracted with King Research, Inc. to survey the libraries of the state and present a final report by March 31, 1980. King Research is a library consulting firm with extensive experience in surveys and in library planning. All of the public, academic, special, and health sciences libraries and school districts of the state are included in the survey to ensure that every library's needs are considered, which is why it is important that every library complete a questionnaire and return it promptly. However, this is not a referendum, in which the most popular data base design wins; instead, the Committee, the Missouri Libraries Network Board, and the Missouri State Library will add the information from the survey to other considerations in deciding what the next steps should be.

In responding to the survey, librarians should consider what it is that they really need from the data base, regardless of whether it seems to be feasible or cost-effective. The exact design of the data base will come later, when these needs are weighed against the state of the art in library automation. Only at that point can the costs of the data base be determined, as well. Nor is any library committing itself to any plan of action with its answers.

[1] Missouri Library Association. Missouri State Network Plan. September 30, 1977.

[2] Becker and Hayes, Inc. A Statewide Data Base of Bibliographic Records for Missouri Libraries. Los Angeles, Ca.: December 15, 1978; revised 1-1-79.

Copies of both of these documents are available from the Missouri State Library (314) 751-2768.

APPENDIX B

MISSOURI STATEWIDE LIBRARY DATA
BASE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

STATEWIDE
BIBLIOGRAPHIC
DATA BASE
COMMITTEE

Charles Churchwell
James Corey
Thomas Gillies
Donell J. Gaertner
Millard Johnson
Karen Luebbert

Sheila Merrell
Wm. C. Mills
Shannon Roy
Philip Tompkins
W. A. Wilkinson
James Zink

December 19, 1979

Dear Administrator:

We are conducting a survey of the libraries of Missouri to determine their needs for a statewide bibliographic data base. Such a data base would offer the possibility of improving access to existing resources for all users by making current information on the holdings of the state's libraries widely available. It could significantly improve the quality of service in all types of libraries throughout the state, but only if it is designed to meet the needs of the libraries and their users. That is why we are asking your help.

This questionnaire does not require that you know about automation or data bases. It is concerned instead with the services that your library could use which might be provided from a data base. You need not be concerned at this stage with the cost or feasibility of your choices, nor are you committing yourself to any course of action. Nor is this a referendum, to design the data base by majority rule. We are interested in simply assessing the needs and desires of the libraries of the state. Which needs we can fill, and at what cost, will be decided later.

Identifying and reaching all the libraries of Missouri is itself a difficult task. This questionnaire is being sent to all the organizations that we believe may have libraries. <u>If your organization does not have a library</u>, you need only give us your organization's name on the first page of the questionnaire, check the box that indicates no library, and return it to us. This information is very important to us, so we do hope that you will take a minute to do this.

If your organization has a library, but you are not the librarian, please pass this on to an appropriate person. In particular, we are sending this to school districts and not individual school libraries. We would like only one questionnaire returned from each district, on behalf of all the libraries in that district. If you are a school district superintendent, you may want to pass this to a library coordinator or librarian to answer on behalf of all your libraries.

For your information we have included in this packet a Background Paper that explains the proposed statewide bibliographic data base; a glossary of terms that you may find helpful in answering the questions; and a list of people on whom you may call for help, if necessary. We encourage you to involve your staff in answering this questionnaire, especially on questions related to their areas of responsibility.

All questionnaires should be returned in the envelope provided by January 31, 1980.

Thank you very much for your cooperation on this most important project.

Sincerely,

Donell J. Gaertner

Donell J. Gaertner, Chair

MISSOURI STATEWIDE LIBRARY DATA BASE SURVEY

Name of organization: _____

Address: _____

Person filling out this form: _____

Position: _____ Phone: _____

INSTRUCTIONS

Please answer each question as best you can for your library. If you have any questions, at the end of the questionnaire is a list of the members of the Statewide Bibliographic Data Base Committee and the Network Coordinators. You can call any one of them for assistance. You will also find a glossary that may help you with any unfamiliar terms.

We encourage you to consult with other members of your staff on the questions that have special impact on their areas of responsibility. You may even want to copy this questionnaire to give each of them, and consolidate your answers. But please, only return one questionnaire from each library or system. ALL RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL.

If your organization does not have a library, please simply check here ☐ and return the questionnaire.

Please return by Jan. 31, 1980 in the envelope provided. Return to:

King Research, Inc.
6000 Executive Blvd.
Rockville, Md. 20852

1. Please list the names and positions of any other members of your staff who have assisted in answering this questionnaire:

Name	Position
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Check the category that best describes your type of library or institution:

Public library or system	☐	Private university	☐
Community or two-year college	☐	Public school or school district	☐
Public four-year college	☐	Private school or school district	☐
Public university	☐	Special or institutional	☐
Private four-year college	☐	Other: _____	☐

3. How many facilities does your library have? _____ (e.g., public libraries count main library and branches; academic libraries count number of libraries under your administrative control; school districts count the number of school libraries within your district; etc.).

4. In what region of Missouri are you located?

Northwest ☐		Northeast ☐
Kansas City ☐	Mid-Missouri ☐	St. Louis ☐
Southwest ☐		Southeast ☐

A. YOUR LIBRARY

Please answer the following for the last full fiscal or calendar year for which you have figures. Where possible, public libraries should just use the figures reported on the Missouri State Library Application for State Aid Grant, Public Library Statistics. Academic libraries should use figures reported to the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS). If you do not have figures for any of the following, please estimate as best you can and mark all estimates with an asterisk (*). If you can neither provide statistics nor estimate, just leave the appropriate line blank. Fill in as many as you can. You need not go back through your records to compile figures not readily available.

5. Bookstock (include bound periodicals):

   a. Number of volumes (separate physical items) held at end of year: _____

   b. Number of volumes added: _____

   c. Number of titles (separate bibliographic entities, regardless of number of volumes in each) added: _____

   d. Number of microforms (separate physical items): _____

6. Periodical titles currently received (including newspapers): _____

7. All other cataloged library materials, including government documents, technical reports, and audio-visual materials (number of volumes or items; count each physical unit as one): _____

8. Annual Operating Expenditures

   a. Total operating expenditures: _____

   b. Total expenditures on all library materials (including binding): _____

9. Staff: Full time equivalent: _____

10. Circulation: Total annual circulation: _____

11. Interlibrary Loan

	Originals	Photocopies
a. Total items borrowed or received:	_____	_____
b. Total items loaned or sent:	_____	_____

LIBRARY AUTOMATION FUNCTIONS

[Please read this page before proceeding. For specific definitions see the glossary beginning on page 17.]

Once a statewide bibliographic data base exists, it can support a number of automated products and functions. We have to distinguish between the data base itself - a collection of bibliographic records, which in this case are in a form in which a computer can use them - and an automated system using the data base. The latter combines the data base with a computer system capable of using the data base to provide certain services. The data base itself and any system utilizing it could perform many functions, among them:

Cataloging: The catalog records in the data base - from the Library of Congress and/or participating libraries - can provide cataloging information to help other libraries to catalog the same titles.

Catalog Production: As a holdings list, the data base can be used to produce a union catalog of the holdings of the libraries of Missouri. Records can also be extracted to create regional union catalogs, and listings of individual libraries' holdings. This information can be put out on any of the usual catalog media - cards, books, or COM, as well as in machine-readable form.

Periodicals: An automated periodicals system may keep catalog records for periodicals and keep track of which issues have been received. A cooperative periodicals system will show which libraries own which issues of each title.

Acquisitions: A typical automated acquisitions system prints orders; keeps track of items ordered, by fund and by branch or collection; and keeps fund balances. A cooperative acquisitions system allows each library to discover which titles the others have ordered.

Circulation: An automated circulation system checks books in and out; keeps registration files; places holds; issues recall and overdue notices; refuses to check books out to delinquent patrons; and keeps statistics. A cooperative circulation system makes it possible for one library to check another's circulation files to see if it owns a title and whether it is circulating.

Interlibrary loan: The data base can be used to verify the correct bibliographic information for a wanted title and to determine which libraries own it. An automated system based on the data base could also transmit requests from one library to another and keep track of the status of loans.

Management information: An automated system can easily keep statistical records of library activities utilizing the system, and financial records.

B. CURRENT AND PLANNED AUTOMATION

The purpose of this section is to determine the extent of automation among Missouri libraries at this time. We want to know a) which functions (if any) your library has automated or is planning to automate, and b) where applicable, which automated system(s) you are using.

For each function, please pick the column that best describes the current state of automation in your library. Then check the box that best describes the system you are using or considering.

If your current or planned system has been/or will be developed locally, use the term "in-house" wherever a system name is requested.

Library Functions	Currently Automated	Automation Planned			No Plans At This Time
		Within 1 Year	Within 2 Years	Seriously Considering	
12. Cataloging: a. OCLC[1]:					
b. Other automated system. Name: _____					
13. Periodicals: a. OCLC (for cataloging)					
b. Mo. Union List of Serial Publications					
c. Other automated system Name: _____					
14. Ordering of library materials. Name: _____					
15. Circulation Name: _____					
16. Interlibrary loan: a. OCLC ILL module					
b. Other system.[2] (Do NOT include TWX): _____					

(Continued)

[1] Including use of OCLC through a processing center.

[2] E.g., some automated circulation systems can allow one library to check the holdings of another library on the same system and even transmit ILL requests.

B. CURRENT AND PLANNED AUTOMATION (CONT'D)

Library Functions	Currently Automated	Automation Planned			No Plans At This Time
		Within 1 Year	Within 2 Years	Seriously Considering	
17. Reference (data base searching; e.g., DIALOG, BRS, MEDLINE)					
18. Management information (financial and statistical record-keeping)					
19. Other (Please describe below.)					

C. MACHINE-READABLE BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORDS

If your library has not automated any of its processes, please go on to section D.

If you have or are in the process of automating, we want to know about all of your own library's bibliographic records that you have in machine-readable form. Please answer the questions below for as many types of machine-readable records as you have. For example, if you are using both a bibliographic utility such as OCLC and an automated circulation system, you will fill in two columns, one for catalog records, one for circulation records. Feel free to add columns if you need them.

Characteristics	Types of Records				
	Catalog (including OCLC)	Periodical (including MULSP)[2]	Circulation	Other: _____	Other: _____
20. Name of system or vendor: IF YOUR SYSTEM IS IN-HOUSE, please call it "in-house and answer the following question:					
a. Do you use MARC or MARC-like format?					
21. Extent of materials included to date (complete all that apply)					
a. Monographs 1) Number of Titles					
2) Percent of total monographs in collection that this represents:					
3) These represent all monographs acquired since (fill in date):[1]					

[1] If there are OTHER limitations on the monographs included in this data base, please describe in the box or on an attached sheet.

[2] Missouri Union List of Serial Publications.

C. MACHINE-READABLE BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORDS (CONT'D)

Characteristics	Types of Records				
	Catalog (including OCLC)	Periodical (including MULSP)	Circulation	Other: ———	Other: ———
21. (Cont'd) 4) Extent of record in data base (check one): a. Full bibliographic[3] record					
b. Abbreviated bibliographic record					
5) LC Card number included, if available? (Yes or No)					
6) ISBN included, if available? (Yes or No)					
b. Periodicals 1) Number of titles included					
2) Percent of total titles that this represents					
3) Extent of record in data base (check one): a. Full bibliographic record					
b. Abbreviated bibliographic record					
4) LC Card number included, if available? (Yes or No)					
5) ISSN included, if available? (Yes or No)					

[3]Full bibliographic description means complete author, title, edition, publisher, date; an abbreviated description might leave out one or more elements or cut them short; for example, by allowing only a limited number of characters for the author's name.

C. MACHINE-READABLE BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORDS (CONT'D)

Characteristics	Types of Records				
	Catalog (including OCLC)	Periodical (including MULSP)	Circulation	Other: ———	Other: ———
21. (Cont'd) c. Other Materials:[4] 1) Number of titles included					
2) Percent of total items of this type in the collection that this represents					
3) This represents all items of this type acquired since (fill in date):[5]					
d. Other materials:[4] 1) Number of titles included					
2) Percent of total items of this type in the collection that this represents					
3) This represents all items of this type acquired since (fill in date):[5]					

[4]Other kinds of materials not included above. Use (c) and (d) and add lines if needed to list as many different categories of materials as you need.

[5]As in note 1; are there OTHER limitations on which items OF THIS TYPE are included in this data base?

C. MACHINE-READABLE BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORDS (CONT'D)

PLEASE ANSWER QUESTIONS 22 AND 23 FOR ALL TYPES OF MATERIALS INCLUDED IN YOUR DATA BASE(S)

Characteristics	Types of Records				
	Catalog (including OCLC)	Periodical (including MULSP)	Circulation	Other: ____	Other: ____
22. Retrospective conversion in progress? (Yes or No)					
IF YES: a. Expected date of completion:					
b. Number of titles yet to be converted:					
23. Currently adding new acquisitions to data base? (Yes or No)					
IF YES, number of titles you expect to add this year:					

D. DATA BASE NEEDS

A statewide bibliographic data base can be used to perform a variety of functions. In this section we want you to rate each function according to (a) how important the automation of this function is to your library; and b) given your library's current situation and resources, how important it is to you to see this function provided at the statewide data base. For example, in the interlibrary loan function verifying form of entry is very important. You may be using OCLC to accomplish this and find it satisfactory; therefore, it may not be important to you that the statewide data base be available for that purpose.

Circle the number that best reflects your opinion, using the following codes:

1 - Very important
2 - Important
3 - Moderately important
4 - Least important

Function	(a) Importance of Function to Your Library				(b) Importance of Statewide Data Base For This Function			
24. Interlibrary loan								
a. Verifying form of entry	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
b. Determining owning libraries	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
c. Transmitting requests	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
d. Keeping interlibrary circulation records	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
25. Acquisitions								
a. Verifying new titles	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
b. Determining which libraries own a title	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
c. Determining what other libraries have on order	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
d. Ordering	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
e. Book fund accounting	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
26. Cataloging and catalog production								
a. Source of cataloging information	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
b. Catalog production for your own library (cards, COM, etc.)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
c. Production of statewide union catalog in book or microform	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
d. Production of union catalog of your region in book or microform	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

(Continued)

D. DATA BASE NEEDS (CONT'D)

Function	(a) Importance of Function to Your Library				(b) Importance of Statewide Data Base For This Function			
27. Periodicals								
a. Cataloging	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
b. Verifying titles	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
c. Checking in own issues	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
d. Claiming issues not received from publisher	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
e. Determining which other libraries own a given title	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
28. Circulation control	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
29. Miscellaneous								
a. Searching other libraries' holdings by subject headings.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
b. Management information (statistical and financial information)	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
c. Identifying manuscript and archival materials	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

E. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STATEWIDE DATA BASE

There are many choices to be made in deciding what goes into the data base. Although the data base itself is independent of the uses to which it will be put, it is useful to think of it as a kind of union list of the holdings of the state's libraries. Your answer should reflect your need for information about collections in other Missouri libraries. With this in mind, please indicate the preferences of your library for the kinds of materials to be included. Please keep in mind that every added feature is an added cost, and distinguish between those that you consider basic requirements and those that would be nice to have.

Circle the number that best reflects your preference, using the following code:

1 - Required
2 - Useful
3 - Optional
4 - Omit

Type of Material	Date of Publication			
	Within 5 Years	6 to 10 Years Old	11 to 20 Years Old	Older Than 20 Years
30. Adult materials				
a. Fiction	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
b. Non-fiction	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
c. Reference (non-circulating)	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
d. Books in languages other than English	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
e. Periodicals	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
f. Federal documents	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
g. State documents	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
h. Films	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
i. Other (specify):				
_____	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
_____	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
_____	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
31. Juvenile and young adult				
a. Picture books	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
b. Fiction	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
c. Non-fiction	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
d. Periodicals	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
e. Films	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
f. Other (specify):				
_____	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
_____	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

(Continued)

E. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STATEWIDE DATA BASE (CONT'D)

Type of Material	Date of Publication			
	Within 5 Years	6 to 10 Years Old	11 to 20 Years Old	Older Than 20 Years
32. Special collection(s) (specify): _____	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
33. Any other materials that you think should be included, not adequately described above? Please describe.				
_____	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
_____	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
_____	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
_____	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
_____	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
_____	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

F. DATA BASE COSTS

We realize that you cannot say in advance what your library would be able to contribute. *You make no commitment by answering this question.* But, in your estimation, do you think your library would be willing and able to:

	Yes	No	Don't Know
34. Contribute to the costs (in money and/or staff time)			
a. Of putting into the data base the records for your collection?	____	____	____
b. Of adding your new acquisitions?	____	____	____
c. Of changing your records as items are withdrawn from your collection?	____	____	____
35. Contribute to the costs of developing the data base (buying computer equipment, hiring programmers, etc.)?	____	____	____
36. Buy copies of a state and/or regional union catalog on paper or microform?	____	____	____
37. Pay to access the data base online? (That is, to be connected directly to the computer and pay each time you use the system.)	____	____	____

G. GOVERNANCE

A statewide bibliographic data base would have to be the responsibility of some organization. Please circle the number that best reflects your opinion of each alternative.

	Desirable	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Don't Care
38. State Library	1	2	3	4
39. State Library, with advisory committee representing participating libraries	1	2	3	4
40. New organization governed by board representing participating libraries	1	2	3	4
41. Other: _____	1	2	3	4

If the participating libraries are to share in policymaking, how active a role would you want <u>your library</u> to have?

	Desirable	Acceptable	Unacceptable	Don't Care
42. Voting directly on major policy decisions	1	2	3	4
43. Represented by another library of your type from your region (policy decisions made by a committee or board)	1	2	3	4
44. Represented by another library of your type (on committee or board)	1	2	3	4
45. Represented by another library from your region (on committee or board)	1	2	3	4
46. Represented by your network (where established)	1	2	3	4
47. Other: _____	1	2	3	4

Thank you very much for your cooperation. We would appreciate any further comments that you may wish to make. Please use the back cover.

MISSOURI STATEWIDE LIBRARY DATA BASE SURVEY
GLOSSARY

The following definitions may help you in answering the questionnaire. Terms underscored are themselves included elsewhere in the glossary.

Automation - the use of machines, especially computers, to accomplish tasks which were once done manually.

Bibliographic Utility - an organization which has a computer, programs, and a collection of bibliographic records and offers computer-based support for cataloging to a number of libraries. Examples: OCLC, RLIN, Washington Library Network.

Book Catalog - a collection of catalog records published in book form instead of as a card catalog.

Computer-output-microform (COM) Catalog - a record of library holdings produced by computer on microfilm or microfiche. Such a computer-produced catalog can be updated regularly and is inexpensive to produce in multiple copies to be placed in several locations, such as branch libraries.

Data Base - a collection of records, usually in machine-readable form and therefore able to be stored and searched by a computer.

Hardware - the electronic or mechanical components or otherwise physical aspects of a computer.

ISBN - International Standard Book Number - a unique number identifying each book published.

ISSN - International Standard Serial Number - a unique number for each serial published.

LC Card Number - a unique number for each item cataloged by the Library of Congress.

MARC - machine-readable cataloging - LC catalog card information published in machine-readable form, instead of on cards.

Machine-Readable - in a form in which a computer can use the data. Usually on magnetic tape, magnetic disk, or punched cards.

Microfiche, Microfilm, Microform - photographic film used for recording graphic information in a reduced size.

MULSP - Missouri Union List of Serial Publications - a collection of serial records, cataloging and holdings, for about 50 Missouri libraries. It is produced using a small computer at the St. Louis Public Library, and is used to create several printed union lists.

Network - a cooperative organization of libraries of all different types within a given area.

MISSOURI STATEWIDE LIBRARY DATA BASE SURVEY
GLOSSARY (CONT'D)

On-Line - direct communication with a computer. In on-line interaction the computer responds immediately to a command.

OCLC - Formerly Ohio College Library Center, now simply OCLC, Inc. - a major bibliographic utility, used my many libraries for cataloging.

Record - a collection of information pertaining to one item (e.g., a catalog record belongs to a single title) or person (a registration record).

Retrospective Conversion - converting existing catalog records to machine-readable form.

RLIN - Research Libraries' Information Network - a major bibliographic utility. Formerly named BALLOTS.

Terminal - an instrument with a typewriter-like keyboard which allows a person to interact with a computer by entering data or requesting information from the computer's data base.

Washington Library Network(WLN) - a major bibliographic utility.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA BASE COMMITTEE

Donell J. Gaertner
St. Louis County Library
1640 So. Lindbergh
St. Louis, Missouri 63131
314-994-3300

James Corey
410 Clark Hall
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri 65201
314-882-7292

James Zink
Kent Library
Southeast Missouri State University
900 Normal
Cape Girardeau, Missouri 63701
314-651-2235

Charles Churchwell
Dean of Library Services
John M. Olin Library
Washington University
6600 Millbrook Blvd.
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
314-889-5400

Karen Luebbert
Eden Webster Library
475 East Lockwood
St. Louis, Missouri 63119
314-968-0800

Shannon Roy
Southwest Missouri Library Network
Springfield-Greene County Library
397 East Central
Springfield, Missouri 65802
417-869-4621

Sheila Merrell
St. Louis Regional Library Network
Woods Mill Campus
13550 Conway Road
St. Louis, Missouri 63141
314-878-8750

Bill Mills
Parkway North High School
12860 Fee Fee Road
St. Louis, Missouri 63141
314-878-6000

Bill Wilkinson
Monsanto Company
Information Center
800 N. Lindbergh
St. Louis, Missouri 63166
314-694-4736

Thomas Gillies
Linda Hall Library
5109 Cherry St.
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
816-363-4600

Philip Tompkins
University of Missouri-Kansas City
Libraries
5100 Rockhill Road
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
816-276-1531

Millard Johnson
Washington University School of
Medicine Library
4580 Scott Ave.
St. Louis, Missouri 63110
314-454-3711

APPENDIX C
DETAILED TABLES

APPENDIX C

DETAILED TABLES

1	Missouri Libraries Type and Size Categories
2	Descriptive Statistics (Questionnaire Part A)
2A	All Respondents
2B	Public Libraries
2C	Community College
2D	Public and Private Colleges and Universities
2E	Public and Private School Districts
2F	Special and Institutional Libraries
3	Data Base Needs (Questionnaire Part D)
3A	All Respondents
3B	Public Libraries
3C	Community College Libraries
3D	Public and Private Colleges and Universities
3E	Public and Private School Districts
3F	Special and Institutional Libraries
3G	Data Base Needs by Automation Status
3H	OCLC Libraries vs. Non-OCLC
4	Characteristics of the Statewide Data Base (Questionnaire Part E)
4A	All Respondents
4B	Public Libraries
4C	Community College Libraries
4D	Public and Private College & University Libraries
4E	Public and Private School Districts
4F	Special and Institutional Libraries

TABLE 1

Missouri Libraries Type and Size Categories
(Size = Question 5a: Number of Volumes in Collection at End of Year)

TYPE AND SIZE	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
1. Public Libraries	
1 - 15,999 volumes or fewer	23
2 - 16,000 to 36,999	23
3 - 37,000 to 99,999	23
4 - 100,000 volumes or more	22
	91
2. Community College Libraries (no size breakdown)	15
3. Public and Private College and University Libraries	
1 - 49,999 volumes or fewer	12
2 - 50,000 to 99,999	14
3 - 100,000 to 199,999	15
4 - 200,000 volumes or more	11
	52
4. Public and Private school districts	
1 - 9,999 volumes or fewer	150
2 - 10,000 to 19,999	47
3 - 20,000 to 49,999	21
4 - 50,000 volumes or more	16
	234
5. Special and Institutional Libraries	
1 - 4,999 volumes or fewer	48
2 - 5,000 to 9,999	17
3 - 10,000 to 99,999	32
4 - 100,000 volumes or more	7
	104
TOTAL*	496

*2 libraries unclassifiable; information incomplete.

TABLE 2

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FROM RESPONDING LIBRARIES

NOTE: These figures are as reported by the libraries themselves on part A of the questionnaire. Many libraries did not respond to one or more questions, and some responses were inconsistent; for example, total materials expenditures reported as greater than total operating expenditures. These figures are presented exactly as reported, for informational purposes only.

TABLE 2A

ALL RESPONDENTS BY TYPE

Descriptive Statistics from Responding Libraries
(in thousands)

Descriptive Statistics	TYPE					
	Public	Community Colleges	Colleges and Universities	School	Special	All
Bookstock						
Volumes held						
Mean[1]	113	41	198	21	26	113
Total[2]	10,281	613	10,276	4,985	2,673	28,828
(N)[3]	(91)	(15)	(52)	(234)	(104)	(496)
Volumes Added						
Mean	5	2	7	1	1	2
Total	412	28	343	148	69	1,000
(N)	(88)	(14)	(50)	(190)	(84)	(426)
Microforms held						
Mean	4	7	154	5	15	27
Total	256	94	7,412	680	959	9,401
(N)	(66)	(14)	(48)	(151)	(64)	(343)
Periodical Titles Currently Rec'd.						
Mean	.2	.3	2	.1	.4	.4
Total	14	4	90	26	38	173
(N)	(88)	(14)	(52)	(227)	(98)	(479)
All other cataloged library materials						
Mean	7	6	43	5	7	10
Total	505	86	1,956	973	449	3,969
(N)	(71)	(14)	(45)	(195)	(63)	(388)

[1]Mean response per library.

[2]Total, all responding libraries.

[3]Number of libraries answering this question.

TABLE 2A cont'd.

ALL RESPONDENTS

Descriptive Statistics from Responding Libraries
(in thousands)

Descriptive Statistics	TYPE					
	Public	Community Colleges	Colleges and Universities	School	Special	All
Annual Operating Expenditures						
Total Operating Expenditures						
Mean	331	290	447	30	95	186
Total	28,175	3,476	22,367	4,046	5,968	64,032
(N)	(85)	(12)	(50)	(134)	(63)	(344)
Total materials expenditures						
Mean	59	43	180	17	35	53
Total	4,745	557	8,806	2,647	1,982	18,738
(N)	(81)	(13)	(49)	(154)	(56)	(353)
Staff (FTE)[4]						
Mean	21	13	22	3	4	9
Total	1,715	176	1,143	646	338	4,018
(N)	(83)	(14)	(52)	(216)	(96)	(461)
Total Annual Circulation						
Mean	279	28	62	30	15	96
Total	23,684	393	2,993	4,184	682	31,936
(N)	(85)	(14)	(48)	(139)	(46)	(332)
Interlibrary Loan						
Items Borrowed						
Mean	.8	.2	1	.2	.4	.5
Total	34	2	34	23	25	118
(N)	(44)	(10)	(30)	(110)	(58)	(252)
Items Loaned						
Mean	.8	.06	2	.03	2	.7
Total	22	.5	51	3	83[5]	160
(N)	(28)	(9)	(29)	(102)	(50)	(218)

[4]Numbers of staff not scaled in thousands.

[5]Includes Missouri State Library and Linda Hall Library, both of which are major lenders.

TABLE 2B

PUBLIC LIBRARIES BY REGION

Descriptive Statistics from Responding Libraries
(in thousands)

Descriptive Statistics	Region							
	Northwest	Kansas City	Southwest	Mid-Mo.	Northeast	St. Louis	Southeast	All
Bookstock								
Volumes held								
Mean[1]	44	312	78	69	26	208	49	113
Total[2]	479	2806	1089	1030	233	3951	693	10281
(N)[3]	(11)	(9)	(14)	(15)	(9)	(19)	(14)	(91)
Volumes Added								
Mean	2	14	4	4	1	8	2	5
Total	20	109	51	58	7	144	23	412
(N)	(11)	(8)	(14)	(14)	(9)	(19)	(13)	(88)
Microforms held								
Mean	2	3	1	1	.009	16	.2	4
Total	12	18	9	10	.1	204	2	256
(N)	(8)	(6)	(11)	(9)	(7)	(13)	(13)	(66)
Periodical Titles Currently Rec'd.								
Mean	.07	.3	.2	.1	.04	.3	.08	.2
Total	1	2	2	2	.3	5	1	14
(N)	(11)	(8)	(14)	(14)	(9)	(18)	(14)	(88)
All other cataloged library materials								
Mean	8	.7	2	6	.7	20	3	7
Total	84	5	21	63	6	304	23	505
(N)	(10)	(7)	(10)	(11)	(9)	(15)	(9)	(71)

[1]Mean response per library.

[2]Total, all responding libraries.

[3]Number of libraries answering this question.

TABLE 2B cont'd.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES BY REGION

Descriptive Statistics from Responding Libraries
(in thousands)

Descriptive Statistics	Region							
	North-west	Kansas City	South-west	Mid-Mo.	North-east	St. Louis	South east	All
Annual Operating Expenditures								
Total Operating Expenditures								
Mean	68	924	172	168	33	724	102	331
Total	746	7394	2238	2515	200	13753	1328	28174
(N)	(11)	(8)	(13)	(15)	(6)	(19)	(13)	(85)
Total materials expenditures								
Mean	27	156	30	45	8	125	19	59
Total	241	1095	422	542	72	2120	252	4745
(N)	(9)	(7)	(14)	(12)	(9)	(17)	(13)	(81)
Staff (FTE)[4]								
Mean	6	48	12	11	1	49	7	21
Total	61	383	165	172	8	833	93	1715
(N)	(10)	(8)	(14)	(15)	(6)	(17)	(13)	(83)
Total Annual Circulation								
Mean	81	593	189	165	54	624	118	279
Total	889	4147	2456	2306	380	11848	1656	23684
(N)	(11)	(7)	(13)	(14)	(7)	(19)	(14)	(85)
Interlibrary Loan								
Items Borrowed								
Mean	1	1	1	2	.2	1	1	.8
Total	3	3	4	11	.8	5	7	34
(N)	(4)	(4)	(7)	(7)	(5)	(9)	(8)	(44)
Items Loaned								
Mean	-	1	1	.4	-	2	.09	.8
Total	-	4	3	3	-	12	1	22
(N)	(1)	(3)	(3)	(6)	(1)	(8)	(6)	(28)

[4]Numbers of staff not scaled in thousands.

TABLE 2C

COMMUNITY COLLEGES BY REGION

Descriptive Statistics from Responding Libraries
(in thousands)

Descriptive Statistics	Region							
	North-west	Kansas City	South-west	Mid-Mo.	North-east	St. Louis	South-east	All
Bookstock								
Volumes held								
Mean[1]	12	23	26	37	25	67	23	41
Total[2]	12	23	26	146	25	336	43	613
(N)[3]	(1)	(1)	(1)	(4)	(1)	(5)	(2)	(15)
Volumes Added								
Mean	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	2
Total	1	1	1	4	1	18	3	28
(N)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(4)	(1)	(5)	(1)	(14)
Microforms held								
Mean	.07	1	.1	3	.1	15	2	7
Total	.07	1	.1	14	.1	76	2	94
(N)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(4)	(1)	(5)	(1)	(14)
Periodical Titles Currently Rec'd.								
Mean	.1	.2	.3	.2	.3	.4	.4	.3
Total	.1	.2	.3	1	.3	2	.4	4
(N)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(4)	(1)	(5)	(1)	(14)
All other cataloged library materials								
Mean	3	3	2	4	2	12	2	6
Total	3	3	2	16	2	59	2	86
(N)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(4)	(1)	(5)	(1)	(14)

[1]Mean response per library.

[2]Total, all responding libraries.

[3]Number of libraries answering this question.

TABLE 2C cont'd.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES BY REGION

Descriptive Statistics from Responding Libraries
(in thousands)

Descriptive Statistics	Region							
	North-west	Kansas City	South-west	Mid-Mo.	North-east	St. Louis	South east	All
Annual Operating Expenditures								
Total Operating Expenditures								
Mean	-	115	64	58	29	610	41	290
Total	-	115	64	175	29	3052	41	3476
(N)	-	(1)	(1)	(3)	(1)	(5)	(1)	(12)
Total materials expenditures								
Mean	36	17	16	30	14	76	5	43
Total	36	17	16	89	14	380	5	557
(N)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(3)	(1)	(5)	(1)	(13)
Staff (FTE)[4]								
Mean	2	6	3	3	2	30	2	13
Total	2	6	3	13	2	148	2	176
(N)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(4)	(1)	(5)	(1)	(14)
Total Annual Circulation								
Mean	5	16	10	17	12	54	11	28
Total	5	16	10	70	12	269	11	393
(N)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(4)	(1)	(5)	(1)	(14)
Interlibrary Loan								
Items Borrowed								
Mean	.3	.2	.1	.1	-	.1	-	.2
Total	.3	.2	.1	.4	-	1	-	2
(N)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(3)	-	(4)	-	(10)
Items Loaned								
Mean	-	.03	-	.008	.02	.1	-	.06
Total	-	.03	-	.03	.02	.4	-	.5
(N)	-	(1)	(1)	(3)	(1)	(3)	-	(9)

[4]Numbers of staff not scaled in thousands.

TABLE 2D

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES BY REGION

Descriptive Statistics from Responding Libraries
(in thousands)

Descriptive Statistics	Region							
	North-west	Kansas City	South-west	Mid-Mo.	North-east	St. Louis	South-east	All
Bookstock								
Volumes held								
Mean[1]	111	198	112	347	168	187	250	198
Total[2]	555	989	899	3124	337	4121	250	10276
(N)[3]	(5)	(5)	(8)	(9)	(2)	(22)	(1)	(52)
Volumes Added								
Mean	4	7	6	10	9	6	10	7
Total	20	35	36	91	18	133	10	343
(N)	(5)	(5)	(6)	(9)	(2)	(22)	(1)	(50)
Microforms held								
Mean	9	204	112	305	270	109	206	154
Total	47	1019	675	2748	541	2178	206	7412
(N)	(5)	(5)	(6)	(9)	(2)	(20)	(1)	(48)
Periodical Titles Currently Rec'd.								
Mean	1	2	1	3	1	1	2	2
Total	4	11	9	28	2	33	2	90
(N)	(5)	(5)	(8)	(9)	(2)	(22)	(1)	(52)
All other cataloged library materials								
Mean	11	17	49	53	89	39	170	43
Total	45	85	346	425	178	707	170	1956
(N)	(4)	(5)	(7)	(8)	(2)	(18)	(1)	(45)

[1]Mean response per library.

[2]Total, all responding libraries.

[3]Number of libraries answering this question.

TABLE 2D cont'd.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES BY REGION

Descriptive Statistics from Responding Libraries
(in thousands)

Descriptive Statistics	Region							
	North-west	Kansas City	South-west	Mid-Mo.	North-east	St. Louis	South east	All
Annual Operating Expenditures								
Total Operating Expenditures								
Mean	227	489	327	667	401	404	1037	447
Total	907	2447	2288	6000	803	8885	1037	22367
(N)	(4)	(5)	(7)	(9)	(2)	(22)	(1)	(50)
Total materials expenditures								
Mean	101	144	106	286	209	166	420	180
Total	402	718	637	2570	417	3642	420	8806
(N)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(9)	(2)	(22)	(1)	(49)
Staff (FTE)[4]								
Mean	12	26	13	31	14	23	41	22
Total	61	128	100	281	27	505	41	1143
(N)	(5)	(5)	(8)	(9)	(2)	(22)	(1)	(52)
Total Annual Circulation								
Mean	40	61	43	98	84	53	164	62
Total	159	303	303	784	168	1111	164	2993
(N)	(4)	(5)	(7)	(8)	(2)	(21)	(1)	(48)
Interlibrary Loan								
Items Borrowed								
Mean	32	4	.4	1	.2	1	.2	1
Total	65	13	1	8	.4	11	.2	34
(N)	(2)	(3)	(3)	(7)	(2)	(12)	(1)	(30)
Items Loaned								
Mean	1	3	2	3	.1	2	-	2
Total	2	10	6	20	.2	19	-	51
(N)	(2)	(3)	(3)	(7)	(2)	(12)	-	(29)

[4]Numbers of staff not scaled in thousands.

TABLE 2E

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY REGION

Descriptive Statistics from Responding Libraries
(in thousands)

Descriptive Statistics	Region							
	North-west	Kansas City	South-west	Mid-Mo.	North-east	St. Louis	South-east	All
Bookstock								
Volumes held								
Mean[1]	7	71	6	9	14	55	9	21
Total[2]	207	1209	240	454	363	2237	276	4985
(N)[3]	(28)	(17)	(38)	(53)	(27)	(41)	(30)	(234)
Volumes Added								
Mean	.3	2	1	.4	.4	2	.3	1
Total	8	27	21	20	9	58	7	148
(N)	(21)	(12)	(32)	(44)	(23)	(35)	(23)	(190)
Microforms held								
Mean	.04	.2	1	.4	.2	20	6	5
Total	1	2	18	11	4	530	114	680
(N)	(19)	(10)	(23)	(31)	(23)	(26)	(19)	(151)
Periodical Titles Currently Rec'd.								
Mean	.06	.4	.07	.08	.07	.2	.08	.1
Total	2	7	3	4	2	7	2	26
(N)	(27)	(17)	(37)	(52)	(26)	(38)	(30)	(227)
All other cataloged library materials								
Mean	3	10	2	3	2	15	3	5
Total	59	134	68	118	56	258	81	973
(N)	(22)	(14)	(35)	(46)	(23)	(31)	(24)	(195)

[1] Mean response per library.

[2] Total, all responding libraries.

[3] Number of libraries answering this question.

TABLE 2E cont'd.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOL DISTRICTS BY REGION

Descriptive Statistics from Responding Libraries
(in thousands)

Descriptive Statistics	Region							
	North-west	Kansas City	South-west	Mid-Mo.	North-east	St. Louis	South east	All
Annual Operating Expenditures								
Total Operating Expenditures								
Mean	7	75	5	15	6	106	8	30
Total	126	752	108	497	88	2337	139	4046
(N)	(17)	(10)	(20)	(33)	(15)	(22)	(17)	(134)
Total materials expenditures								
Mean	11	36	5	6	6	46	7	17
Total	213	502	97	194	112	1389	141	2647
(N)	(19)	(14)	(19)	(35)	(18)	(30)	(19)	(154)
Staff (FTE)[4]								
Mean	1	9	1	2	2	6	2	3
Total	30	145	45	96	50	214	66	646
(N)	(24)	(16)	(35)	(52)	(26)	(34)	(29)	(216)
Total Annual Circulation								
Mean	16	160	14	23	31	30	12	30
Total	249	1437	334	717	503	719	226	4184
(N)	(16)	(9)	(24)	(31)	(16)	(24)	(19)	(139)
Interlibrary Loan								
Items Borrowed								
Mean	.1	.5	.3	.3	.1	.03	.3	.2
Total	2	4	4	7	2	1	3	23
(N)	(17)	(8)	(16)	(24)	(16)	(18)	(11)	(110)
Items Loaned								
Mean	.006	.3	-	-	.02	.03	.008	.03
Total	.1	2	-	-	.3	1	.1	3
(N)	(17)	(7)	(16)	(18)	(14)	(18)	(12)	(102)

[4]Numbers of staff not scaled in thousands.

TABLE 2F

SPECIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL LIBRARIES BY REGION

Descriptive Statistics from Responding Libraries
(in thousands)

Descriptive Statistics	Region							
	North-west	Kansas City	South-west	Mid-Mo.	North-east	St. Louis	South-east	All
Bookstock								
Volumes held								
Mean[1]	6	29	1	71	25	22	.5	26
Total[2]	50	733	4	640	51	1193	1	2673
(N)[3]	(8)	(25)	(3)	(9)	(2)	(55)	(2)	(104)
Volumes Added								
Mean	.2	1	.05	1	1	1	.05	1
Total	2	26	.1	10	3	26	.05	69
(N)	(7)	(20)	(2)	(7)	(2)	(45)	(1)	(84)
Microforms held								
Mean	-	39	-	21	.2	6	.01	15
Total	-	619	-	128	.3	212	.02	959
(N)	(2)	(16)	(1)	(6)	(2)	(35)	(2)	(64)
Periodical Titles Currently Rec'd.								
Mean	.1	1	.03	.4	.4	.2	.1	.4
Total	1	20	.06	3	1	13	.2	38
(N)	(7)	(22)	(2)	(8)	(2)	(55)	(2)	(98)
All other cataloged library materials								
Mean	1	8	4	22	2	6	.3	7
Total	4	118	8	109	4	205	1	449
(N)	(5)	(14)	(2)	(5)	(2)	(33)	(2)	(163)

[1]Mean response per library.

[2]Total, all responding libraries.

[3]Number of libraries answering this question.

TABLE 2F cont'd.

SPECIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL LIBRARIES BY REGION

Descriptive Statistics from Responding Libraries
(in thousands)

Descriptive Statistics	Region							
	North-west	Kansas City	South-west	Mid-Mo.	North-east	St. Louis	South east	All
Annual Operating Expenditures								
Total Operating Expenditures								
Mean	26	135	13	196	78	71	2	95
Total	132	2297	13	1179	157	2188	2	5968
(N)	(5)	(17)	(1)	(6)	(2)	(31)	(1)	(63)
Total materials expenditures								
Mean	4	61	3	20	81	28	-	35
Total	18	976	3	123	81	782	-	1982
(N)	(4)	(16)	(1)	(6)	(1)	(28)	-	(56)
Staff (FTE)[4]								
Mean	2	2	1	8	4	4	1	4
Total	14	44	2	74	7	195	2	338
(N)	(7)	(22)	(2)	(9)	(2)	(52)	(2)	(96)
Total Annual Circulation								
Mean	10	10	3	11	5	20	-	15
Total	29	139	3	34	5	473	-	682
(N)	(3)	(14)	(1)	(3)	(1)	(24)	-	(46)
Interlibrary Loan								
Items Borrowed								
Mean	.2	.6	.1	.08	.1	.5	-	.4
Total	1	8	.2	.2	.1	16	-	25
(N)	(5)	(14)	(2)	(2)	(1)	(34)	-	(58)
Items Loaned								
Mean	.04	5	-	1	-	1	-	2
Total	.1	57	-	3	-	23	-	83
(N)	(3)	(11)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(32)	-	(50)

[4]Numbers of staff not scaled in thousands.

TABLE 3A

Data Base Needs

ALL RESPONDENTS

Mean Value of Responses

Rankings:
1 - Very important
2 - Important
3 - Moderately important
4 - Least important
Low number = more important

Columns:
a - Importance of function to your library
b - Importance of statewide data base for this function

Function	(a) (427)	(b) (395)
Interlibrary loan		
a. Verifying form of entry	2.6	2.4
b. Determining owning libraries	2.3	2.0
c. Transmitting requests	2.5	2.2
d. Keeping interlibrary circulation records	3.0	2.7
Acquisitions		
a. Verifying new titles	2.6	2.5
b. Determining which libraries own a title	2.6	2.2
c. Determining what other libraries have on order	3.2	2.7
d. Ordering	2.8	3.0
e. Book fund accounting	3.1	3.2
Cataloging and catalog production		
a. Source of cataloging information	2.2	2.3
b. Catalog production for your own library (cards, COM, etc.)	2.4	2.5
c. Production of statewide union catalog in book or microform	2.8	2.2
d. Production of union catalog of your region in book or microform	2.6	2.2

TABLE 3A (cont'd)

Function	(a)	(b)
Periodicals		
a. Cataloging	3.3	2.9
b. Verifying titles	2.9	2.6
c. Checking in own issues	3.0	3.1
d. Claiming issues not received from publisher	2.8	2.9
e. Determining which other libraries own a given title	2.3	2.0
Circulation control	2.9	3.0
Miscellaneous		
a. Searching other libraries' holdings by subject headings	2.5	2.1
b. Management information (statistical and financial information)	3.0	2.9
c. Identifying manuscript and archival materials	3.4	2.9

TABLE 3B

Data Base Needs

PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Mean Values of Responses

Rankings:
1 - Very important
2 - Important
3 - Moderately important
4 - Least important
Low number = more important

Columns:
a - Importance of function to your library
b - Importance of statewide data base for this function

Function	Library Size (no. of responses)									
	1 (small) (14)		2 (19)		3 (20)		4 (large) (22)		ALL (75)	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
Interlibrary loan										
a. Verifying form of entry	2.8	2.1	2.8	2.2	2.5	2.1	2.0	2.3	2.5	2.2
b. Determining owning libraries	2.5	1.9	2.2	1.9	2.1	1.4	2.0	1.7	2.2	1.7
c. Transmitting requests	2.5	2.1	2.1	1.8	2.1	1.5	2.4	2.3	2.2	1.9
d. Keeping interlibrary circulation records	2.8	2.6	3.1	2.5	2.2	2.4	2.9	2.9	2.7	2.6
Acquisitions										
a. Verifying new titles	2.9	2.2	2.7	2.7	2.4	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6
b. Determining which libraries own a title	3.1	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.7	2.4	2.1	2.1	2.5	2.2
c. Determining what other libraries have on order	3.2	2.6	2.8	2.7	3.3	3.0	2.7	2.6	3.0	2.7
d. Ordering	3.1	2.7	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.4	2.6	3.4	2.8	3.2
e. Book fund accounting	3.3	2.6	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.6	2.6	3.8	3.1	3.4
Cataloging and catalog production										
a. Source of cataloging information	2.8	2.1	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.3	3.1	2.6	2.7
b. Catalog production for your own library (cards, COM, etc.)	3.1	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.7	3.1	2.4	3.0	2.7	2.9
c. Production of statewide union catalog in book or microform	3.1	2.2	2.9	2.4	2.7	2.3	2.6	2.1	2.8	2.2
d. Production of union catalog of your region in book or microform	3.1	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.0	2.5	2.2

TABLE 3B (cont'd)

Function	Library Size									
	1 (small)		2		3		4 (large)		ALL	
Periodicals	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
a. Cataloging	3.7	2.9	3.5	2.9	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.2
b. Verifying titles	3.5	2.7	3.5	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.2	2.9
c. Checking in own issues	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.4	3.1	3.8	3.1	3.4
d. Claiming issues not received from publisher	3.6	3.1	3.2	3.3	2.9	3.4	3.0	3.8	3.1	3.4
e. Determining which other libraries own a given title	2.9	2.4	2.6	2.3	2.8	2.5	2.1	2.1	2.6	2.3
Circulation control	3.3	2.8	2.3	2.7	2.3	3.2	2.1	2.9	2.4	2.9
Miscellaneous										
a. Searching other libraries' holdings by subject headings	2.7	2.0	3.0	2.4	2.4	2.1	2.1	1.9	2.5	2.1
b. Management information (statistical and financial information)	3.1	2.5	3.0	2.8	2.6	3.1	2.4	3.3	2.7	2.9
c. Identifying manuscript and archival materials	3.5	2.4	3.3	2.6	3.3	2.6	3.6	2.8	3.4	2.6

TABLE 3C

Data Base Needs

COMMUNITY COLLEGE LIBRARIES

Mean Values of Responses

Rankings:
1 - Very important
2 - Important
3 - Moderately important
4 - Least important
Low number = more important

Columns:
a - Importance of function to your library
b - Importance of statewide data base for this function

Function	(a) (15) respondents	(b) (15) respondents
Interlibrary loan		
a. Verifying form of entry	2.5	2.3
b. Determining owning libraries	1.9	1.9
c. Transmitting requests	2.7	2.4
d. Keeping interlibrary circulation records	2.7	2.7
Acquisitions		
a. Verifying new titles	2.8	2.8
b. Determining which libraries own a title	2.7	2.4
c. Determining what other libraries have on order	3.3	2.9
d. Ordering	2.9	3.2
e. Book fund accounting	2.9	3.2
Cataloging and catalog production		
a. Source of cataloging information	2.3	2.1
b. Catalog production for your own library (cards, COM, etc.)	2.3	2.5
c. Production of statewide union catalog in book or microform	2.6	2.1
d. Production of union catalog of your region in book or microform	2.5	1.9

TABLE 3C (cont'd)

Function	(a)	(b)
Periodicals		
a. Cataloging	3.7	3.3
b. Verifying titles	2.9	2.6
c. Checking in own issues	3.1	3.3
d. Claiming issues not received from publisher	2.7	2.8
e. Determining which other libraries own a given title	2.3	2.1
Circulation control	2.6	3.0
Miscellaneous		
a. Searching other libraries' holdings by subject headings	2.3	1.8
b. Management information (statistical and financial information)	2.9	2.1
c. Identifying manuscript and archival materials	3.1	2.5

TABLE 3D

Data Base Needs

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mean Values of Responses

Rankings:
1 - Very important
2 - Important
3 - Moderately important
4 - Least important
Low number = more important

Columns:
a - Importance of function to your library
b - Importance of statewide data base for this function

Function	Library Size (no. of responses)									
	1 (small) (12)		2 (13)		3 (15)		4 (large) (11)		ALL (44)	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
Interlibrary loan										
a. Verifying form of entry	2.0	2.7	1.5	2.5	1.7	2.5	1.6	2.6	1.7	2.6
b. Determining owning libraries	1.2	2.6	1.2	1.8	1.6	1.8	1.4	2.0	1.3	2.0
c. Transmitting requests	2.0	2.7	1.9	2.0	2.4	2.2	1.5	2.5	2.0	2.4
d. Keeping interlibrary circulation records	2.2	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.3	3.4	2.1	2.9	2.7	3.1
Acquisitions										
a. Verifying new titles	1.9	2.7	1.9	2.2	1.9	2.4	1.5	2.6	1.8	2.5
b. Determining which libraries own a title	2.1	2.3	2.7	2.3	2.9	2.2	2.4	2.1	2.6	2.2
c. Determining what other libraries have on order	3.0	2.9	3.2	2.4	3.2	2.8	2.5	2.1	3.0	2.6
d. Ordering	2.2	2.8	2.4	3.6	2.7	3.1	1.5	2.6	2.2	3.0
e. Book fund accounting	2.5	3.3	2.5	3.8	3.1	3.3	1.2	2.6	2.4	3.2
Cataloging and catalog production										
a. Source of cataloging information	1.3	2.3	1.4	2.9	1.3	2.0	1.3	2.8	1.3	2.5
b. Catalog production for your own library (cards, COM, etc.)	1.8	2.5	1.3	3.3	1.5	2.3	1.3	2.6	1.5	2.7
c. Production of statewide union catalog in book or microform	3.1	2.8	2.2	1.8	2.5	1.9	2.4	2.0	2.5	2.2
d. Production of union catalog of your region in book or microform	2.7	2.6	2.0	1.9	2.2	1.9	2.6	2.1	2.3	2.1

TABLE 3D (cont'd)

Function	Library Size									
	1 (small)		2		3		4 (large)		ALL	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
Periodicals										
a. Cataloging	3.0	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.2	1.7	2.8	2.9	3.1
b. Verifying titles	1.9	2.3	1.9	2.2	1.9	2.2	1.2	2.4	1.7	2.3
c. Checking in own issues	2.6	2.9	3.2	3.8	2.4	2.8	2.1	2.9	2.6	3.1
d. Claiming issues not received from publisher	2.3	3.0	2.9	3.8	2.4	2.9	2.1	2.7	2.4	3.1
e. Determining which other libraries own a given title	1.7	1.7	1.4	1.4	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.2	1.7	1.6
Circulation control	2.7	2.7	3.2	3.7	2.6	3.0	1.8	2.7	2.6	3.0
Miscellaneous										
a. Searching other libraries' holdings by subject headings	2.9	2.6	2.5	1.8	2.4	1.9	2.1	1.7	2.5	2.0
b. Management information (statistical and financial information)	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.6	2.9	3.3	1.5	2.6	2.6	3.1
c. Identifying manuscript and archival materials	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.2	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.6	3.1	3.0

TABLE 3E

Data Base Needs

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mean Values of Responses

Rankings:

1 - Very important
2 - Important
3 - Moderately important
4 - Least important
Low number = more important

Columns:

a - Importance of function to your library
b - Importance of statewide data base for this function

Function	Library Size (no. of responses)									
	1 (small) (129)		2 (37)		3 (18)		4 (large) (14)		ALL (197)	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
Interlibrary loan										
a. Verifying form of entry	3.0	2.4	3.0	2.4	2.9	2.7	2.8	1.9	3.0	2.4
b. Determining owning libraries	3.0	2.3	2.8	2.1	2.7	2.4	2.5	1.6	2.9	2.2
c. Transmitting requests	2.8	2.1	2.9	2.2	2.8	2.6	2.6	1.5	2.8	2.2
d. Keeping interlibrary circulation records	3.2	2.6	3.4	2.7	2.7	2.5	3.3	2.2	3.2	2.6
Acquisitions										
a. Verifying new titles	3.0	2.5	2.6	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.0	2.8	2.4
b. Determining which libraries own a title	2.7	2.1	2.5	1.9	2.8	2.0	2.5	1.7	2.6	2.1
c. Determining what other libraries have on order	3.3	2.7	3.1	2.6	3.2	2.7	3.2	2.5	3.2	2.6
d. Ordering	3.1	2.8	3.0	2.7	2.4	2.6	2.8	2.3	3.0	2.7
e. Book fund accounting	3.4	3.1	3.1	2.9	2.7	2.6	3.0	2.8	3.3	3.0
Cataloging and catalog production										
a. Source of cataloging information	2.3	2.0	2.4	2.1	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.6	2.2	2.0
b. Catalog production for your own library (cards, COM, etc.)	2.4	2.3	2.6	2.3	2.0	2.2	2.1	1.8	2.4	2.3
c. Production of statewide union catalog in book or microform	2.9	2.3	2.8	2.0	2.9	2.3	2.5	1.8	2.9	2.2
d. Production of union catalog of your region in book or microform	2.8	2.4	2.5	2.0	2.8	2.5	2.3	2.0	2.7	2.3

TABLE 3E (cont'd)

Function	Library Size									
	1 (small)		2		3		4 (large)		ALL	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
Periodicals										
a. Cataloging	3.4	2.7	3.2	2.6	3.3	2.8	3.9	2.7	3.4	2.7
b. Verifying titles	3.2	2.7	3.1	2.5	3.3	2.6	3.3	2.5	3.2	2.6
c. Checking in own issues	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.7	3.4	3.3	3.1	3.0
d. Claiming issues not received from publisher	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.9	2.7
e. Determining which other libraries own a given title	2.6	2.2	2.9	2.2	2.4	1.9	2.4	1.8	2.6	2.1
Circulation control	3.2	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.8	3.2	2.9	3.1	2.9
Miscellaneous										
a. Searching other libraries' holdings by subject headings	2.5	2.2	2.6	2.1	2.6	2.1	2.5	1.8	2.5	2.1
b. Management information (statistical and financial information)	3.4	2.9	3.3	2.9	3.1	2.7	3.0	2.5	3.3	2.9
c. Identifying manuscript and archival materials	3.5	2.9	3.5	2.7	3.5	2.7	3.5	2.7	3.5	2.8

TABLE 3F

Data Base Needs

SPECIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL LIBRARIES

Mean Values of Responses

Rankings:
1 - Very important
2 - Important
3 - Moderately important
4 - Least important
Low number = more important

Columns:
a - Importance of function to your library
b - Importance of statewide data base for this function

Function	Library Size (no. of responses)									
	1 (small) (40)		2 (15)		3 (27)		4 (large) (6)		ALL (76)	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
Interlibrary loan										
a. Verifying form of entry	2.7	2.5	2.2	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.2	3.0	2.5	2.6
b. Determining owning libraries	2.1	2.0	1.9	2.2	1.7	1.8	2.5	2.4	1.9	2.0
c. Transmitting requests	2.4	2.3	2.1	2.6	2.3	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.3
d. Keeping interlibrary circulation records	3.1	3.0	2.7	3.2	2.9	3.1	2.5	3.3	2.9	3.1
Acquisitions										
a. Verifying new titles	2.6	2.4	2.9	3.2	2.4	2.6	2.7	3.0	2.6	2.6
b. Determining which libraries own a title	2.5	2.2	2.7	2.6	2.3	2.3	3.2	2.4	2.5	2.3
c. Determining what other libraries have on order	3.1	3.0	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.2	2.7	3.2	3.1
d. Ordering	2.9	3.1	3.5	3.6	2.7	3.1	3.0	3.1	2.9	3.2
e. Book fund accounting	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.0	3.3	3.4	3.5
Cataloging and catalog production										
a. Source of cataloging information	2.5	2.4	2.7	3.3	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.6
b. Catalog production for your own library (cards, COM, etc.)	2.7	2.6	2.9	3.4	2.4	2.6	2.2	3.1	2.6	2.7
c. Production of statewide union catalog in book or microform	2.6	2.1	3.3	2.6	2.7	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.7	2.3
d. Production of union catalog of your region in book or microform	2.5	2.1	3.1	2.6	2.4	2.2	3.0	2.1	2.6	2.2

TABLE 3F (cont'd)

Function	Library Size									
	1 (small)		2		3		4 (large)		ALL	
Periodicals	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
a. Cataloging	3.2	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.1	2.8	3.4	3.2	3.1
b. Verifying titles	2.7	2.5	2.9	2.8	2.5	2.7	2.3	2.9	2.6	2.6
c. Checking in own issues	2.8	2.8	3.2	3.9	2.8	3.1	1.8	3.3	2.8	3.1
d. Claiming issues not received from publisher	2.7	2.7	2.9	3.7	2.4	2.7	2.0	2.9	2.6	2.8
e. Determining which other libraries own a given title	1.9	1.9	2.4	2.3	1.7	1.6	2.2	2.1	1.9	1.9
Circulation control	3.2	3.0	3.3	3.6	3.0	3.1	2.2	3.3	3.1	3.2
Miscellaneous										
a. Searching other libraries' holdings by subject headings	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.8	2.7	2.4	2.3
b. Management information (statistical and financial information)	3.0	2.9	3.1	2.9	2.8	3.1	2.3	3.1	2.9	2.9
c. Identifying manuscript and archival materials	3.2	2.9	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.8	3.3	3.2	3.1

TABLE 3G

DATA BASE NEEDS BY AUTOMATION STATUS

Mean Values of Responses

Rankings:
1 - Very important
2 - Important
3 - Moderately important
4 - Least important
Low number = more important

Columns:
a - Importance of function to your library
b - Importance of statewide data base for this function

Function	Automation Status (number of respondents)					
	At Least one Function Automated (108)		Planning or Considering Automating at Least One Function (31)		No Plans to Automate (289)	
	a	b	a	b	a	b
Interlibrary loan						
a. Verifying form of entry	2.0	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.9	2.4
b. Determining owning libraries	1.6	1.7	1.9	2.0	2.7	2.2
c. Transmitting requests	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.7	2.2
d. Keeping interlibrary circulation records	2.6	2.8	2.6	3.0	3.2	2.7
Acquisitions						
a. Verifying new titles	2.2	2.5	2.2	2.3	2.8	2.5
b. Determining which libraries own a title	2.5	2.2	2.2	2.0	2.6	2.2
c. Determining what other libraries have on order	3.0	2.7	3.1	2.9	3.2	2.7
d. Ordering	2.5	3.1	2.5	3.2	3.0	2.9
e. Book fund accounting	2.7	3.4	2.9	3.7	3.3	3.1
Cataloging and catalog production						
a. Source of cataloging information	1.8	2.5	2.1	2.4	2.4	2.2
b. Catalog production for your own library (cards, COM, etc.)	1.9	2.7	2.4	2.8	2.6	2.4
c. Production of statewide union catalog in book or microform	2.3	2.0	2.8	2.3	2.9	2.3
d. Production of union catalog of your region in book or microform	2.3	2.0	2.3	2.1	2.8	2.3

TABLE 3G (Cont'd)

Function	Automation Status (number of respondents)					
	At Least one Function Automated (108)		Planning or Considering Automating at Least One Function (31)		No Plans to Automate (289)	
	a	b	a	b	a	b
Periodicals						
a. Cataloging	3.0	3.2	3.6	3.1	3.4	2.8
b. Verifying titles	2.2	2.4	2.7	2.6	3.2	2.7
c. Checking in own issues	2.7	3.1	2.7	3.4	3.1	3.1
d. Claiming issues not received from publisher	2.6	3.1	2.3	3.0	2.9	2.8
e. Determining which other libraries own a given title	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.5	2.6	2.2
Circulation control	2.7	3.1	2.4	3.0	3.1	2.9
Miscellaneous						
a. Searching other libraries' holdings by subject headings.	2.2	2.0	2.3	2.1	2.6	2.2
b. Management information (statistical and financial information)	2.5	3.0	2.8	3.2	3.3	2.9
c. Identifying manuscript and archival materials	3.2	2.9	3.3	2.7	3.5	2.8

TABLE 3H

Data Base Needs

OCLC LIBRARIES VS. NON-OCLC LIBRARIES

Mean Values of Responses

Rankings:
1 - Very important
2 - Important
3 - Moderately important
4 - Least important
Low number = more important

Columns:
a - Importance of function to your library
b - Importance of statewide data base for this function

Function	Libraries Using OCLC (47 responses)		Libraries Not Using OCLC (381 responses)	
	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)
Interlibrary loan				
a. Verifying form of entry	1.8	2.8	2.7	2.4
b. Determining owning libraries	1.4	2.0	2.4	2.0
c. Transmitting requests	2.0	2.4	2.6	2.1
d. Keeping interlibrary circulation records	2.7	3.0	3.0	2.7
Acquisitions				
a. Verifying new titles	2.1	2.7	2.7	2.5
b. Determining which libraries own a title	2.7	2.3	2.5	2.1
c. Determining what other libraries have on order	2.9	2.5	3.2	2.8
d. Ordering	2.4	3.2	2.9	2.9
e. Book fund accounting	2.5	3.2	3.2	3.2
Cataloging and catalog production				
a. Source of cataloging information	1.5	2.9	2.3	2.2
b. Catalog production for your own library (cards, COM, etc.)	1.6	3.1	2.5	2.5
c. Production of statewide union catalog in book or microform	2.4	2.2	2.8	2.2
d. Production of union catalog of your region in book or microform	2.5	2.3	2.6	2.2

TABLE 3H (cont'd)

Function	Libraries Using OCLC		Libraries Not Using OCLC	
	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)
Periodicals				
a. Cataloging	2.9	3.0	3.4	2.9
b. Verifying titles	2.0	2.5	3.0	2.7
c. Checking in own issues	2.8	3.1	3.0	3.1
d. Claiming issues not received from publisher	2.6	3.1	2.8	2.9
e. Determining which other libraries own a given title	1.8	1.6	2.4	2.1
Circulation control	2.6	3.0	2.9	3.0
Miscellaneous				
a. Searching other libraries' holdings by subject headings	2.2	2.0	2.5	2.2
b. Management information (statistical and financial information)	2.3	3.0	3.1	2.9
c. Identifying manuscript and archival materials	3.3	2.9	3.4	2.8

TABLE 4A

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STATEWIDE DATA BASE
All Respondents

(401 respondents)

Mean Values of Responses

Rankings: 1 - Required
2 - Useful
3 - Optional
4 - Omit

Type of Material	Date of Publication			
	Within 5 Years	6 to 10 Years Old	11 to 20 Years Old	Older Than 20 Years
Adult materials				
a. Fiction	2.3	2.7	3.0	3.2
b. Non-fiction	1.5	1.9	2.6	2.9
c. Reference (non-circulating)	1.8	2.3	2.9	3.2
d. Books in languages other than English	3.0	3.2	3.4	3.5
e. Periodicals	1.7	2.1	2.7	3.0
f. Federal documents	2.3	2.8	3.2	3.3
g. State documents	2.3	2.8	3.2	3.3
h. Films	2.3	2.8	3.4	3.6
Juvenile and young adult				
a. Picture books	2.8	3.0	3.4	3.6
b. Fiction	2.4	2.7	3.2	3.4
c. Non-fiction	2.2	2.6	3.2	3.4
d. Periodicals	2.6	3.1	3.5	3.6
e. Films	2.5	3.0	3.5	3.7

TABLE 4B

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STATEWIDE DATA BASE

Public Libraries
(73 respondents)

Mean Values of Responses

Rankings: 1 - Required 3 - Optional
2 - Useful 4 - Omit

Type of Material	Date of Publication			
	Within 5 Years	6 to 10 Years Old	11 to 20 Years Old	Older Than 20 Years
Adult materials				
a. Fiction	1.9	2.4	2.6	2.7
b. Non-fiction	1.2	1.7	2.5	2.7
c. Reference (non-circulating)	1.9	2.5	3.1	3.3
d. Books in languages other than English	3.0	3.3	3.6	3.6
e. Periodicals	1.9	2.4	3.0	3.2
f. Federal documents	2.6	3.1	3.4	3.4
g. State documents	2.4	3.0	3.3	3.4
h. Films	2.9	3.3	3.6	3.5
Juvenile and young adult				
a. Picture books	2.8	3.1	3.3	3.3
b. Fiction	2.3	2.6	2.9	3.1
c. Non-fiction	2.1	2.5	3.1	3.3
d. Periodicals	2.9	3.3	3.6	3.6
e. Films	2.9	3.3	3.6	3.6

TABLE 4C

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STATEWIDE DATA BASE

Community College Libraries
(15 respondents)

Mean Values of Responses

Rankings: 1 - Required 3 - Optional
2 - Useful 4 - Omit

Type of Material	Date of Publication			
	Within 5 Years	6 to 10 Years Old	11 to 20 Years Old	Older Than 20 Years
Adult materials				
a. Fiction	2.3	2.5	2.7	2.9
b. Non-fiction	1.5	1.7	2.2	2.5
c. Reference (non-circulating)	1.9	2.2	2.7	3.0
d. Books in languages other than English	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.0
e. Periodicals	1.7	2.2	2.5	2.5
f. Federal documents	2.1	2.6	3.3	3.4
g. State documents	2.1	2.7	3.2	3.3
h. Films	2.3	2.7	3.0	3.2
Juvenile and young adult				
a. Picture books	3.0	3.3	3.4	3.5
b. Fiction	2.5	2.8	3.2	3.3
c. Non-fiction	2.5	2.9	3.2	3.3
d. Periodicals	2.6	3.3	3.5	3.5
e. Films	2.8	3.2	3.5	3.5

TABLE 4D

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STATEWIDE DATA BASE

Public and Private College & University Libraries

(50 respondents)

Mean Values of Responses

Rankings: 1 - Required 3 - Optional
2 - Useful 4 - Omit

Type of Material	Date of Publication			
	Within 5 Years	6 to 10 Years Old	11 to 20 Years Old	Older Than 20 Years
Adult materials				
a. Fiction	2.3	2.6	3.0	3.0
b. Non-fiction	1.2	1.4	2.0	2.3
c. Reference (non-circulating)	1.5	2.0	2.4	2.6
d. Books in languages other than English	2.3	2.6	2.9	3.0
e. Periodicals	1.3	1.5	2.0	2.1
f. Federal documents	1.9	2.3	2.9	3.0
g. State documents	2.3	2.6	3.0	3.1
h. Films	2.6	3.0	3.5	3.6
Juvenile and young adults				
a. Picture books	3.2	3.4	3.5	3.7
b. Fiction	3.0	3.2	3.5	3.7
c. Non-fiction	2.8	3.1	3.5	3.7
d. Periodicals	3.1	3.3	3.6	3.7
e. Films	3.0	3.2	3.7	3.7

TABLE 4E

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STATEWIDE DATA BASE

Public and Private School Districts

(191 respondents)

Mean Values of Responses

Rankings: 1 - Required 3 - Optional
2 - Useful 4 - Omit

Type of Material	Date of Publication			
	Within 5 Years	6 to 10 Years Old	11 to 20 Years Old	Older Than 20 Years
Adult materials				
a. Fiction	2.1	2.4	2.9	3.2
b. Non-fiction	1.4	1.9	2.6	3.0
c. Reference (non-circulating)	1.9	2.3	2.9	3.2
d. Books in languages other than English	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.6
e. Periodicals	1.7	2.4	2.9	3.3
f. Federal documents	2.4	2.9	3.2	3.4
g. State documents	2.4	2.8	3.2	3.3
h. Films	1.9	2.5	3.2	3.5
Juvenile and young adults				
a. Picture books	2.4	2.6	3.2	3.5
b. Fiction	1.9	2.3	3.0	3.3
c. Non-fiction	1.5	2.0	2.9	3.3
d. Periodicals	1.9	2.7	3.3	3.5
e. Films	1.8	2.5	3.3	3.6

TABLE 4F

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STATEWIDE DATA BASE

Special and Institutional Libraries

(72 respondents)

Mean Values of Responses

Rankings: 1 - Required 3 - Optional
2 - Useful 4 - Omit

Type of Material	Date of Publication			
	Within 5 Years	6 to 10 Years Old	11 to 20 Years Old	Older Than 20 Years
Adult materials				
a. Fiction	3.4	3.5	3.7	3.8
b. Non-fiction	2.1	2.4	3.0	3.3
c. Reference (non-circulating)	1.9	2.4	3.0	3.3
d. Books in languages other than English	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.7
e. Periodicals	1.6	1.8	2.4	2.7
f. Federal documents	1.9	2.5	3.0	3.2
g. State documents	2.1	2.5	3.0	3.1
h. Films	2.8	3.2	3.6	3.7
Juvenile and young adult				
a. Picture books	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.8
b. Fiction	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.8
c. Non-fiction	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.8
d. Periodicals	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.8
e. Films	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.8